SPEECHES AND LETTERS

of

GERRITT SMITH.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. Speech on suffrage, Albany, February 28, 1856.
2. Speech in the Kansas meeting, Albany, March 13, 1856.
3. Letter to Frederick Douglas, July 13, 1860.
4. No terms with traitors. August 13, 1861.
5. Letter to John A. Gurley, December 16, 1861.
6. Letter to George Thompson. England needs to soothe America. January 25, 1862.
7. To his townsmen. October 6, 1862.
8. The two unions. October 28, 1862.
9. To Dr. Cheever. March 6, 1863.
10. Denying suffrage even to soldiers! Another proof that the nation is ruined! April 20, 1863.
11. "Stonewall" Jackson. Letter to Henry Ward Beecher. May 20, 1863.
12. Smithfield's bounty to Smithfield's volunteers. November 30, 1863.
13. The rebellion. Speech in Montreal, Dec. 19, 1863.
14. Letter to Hon. D. Littlejohn on the country. Jan. 14, 1864.
15. To his neighbors. February 24, 1864.
16. On the Fort Pillow ad Plymouth massacres. April 26, 1864.
17. An appeal to patriotism to the people of the town of Smithfield. July 2, 1864.
18. To the rank and file of the Democratic party. October 20, 1864.
19. Letter to William Lloyd Garrison. February 22, 1865.
20. Letter to Horace Greeley. A plea for the South. March 6, 1865.
21. Sermon in Peterboro, May 21, 1865.
22. Letter to Chief Justice Chase. May 28, 1866
23. Jugglery. December 20, 1867.
24. Has the Chief Justice a casting vote? April 11, 1868.
25. Destroy not man's faith in man! June 12, 1868.
26. Letter to General Lee. September 25, 1868.
27. Used to it. Not used to it. June 28, 1869.
28. What is the true basis of religion? October 27, 1869.
29. Address of the convention of the New York Anti-dramshop party. August 17, 1870.
30. Address to New York state anti-secret society convention. November 15-17, 1870.
31. To the anti-dramshop party. November 6, 1872.
32. On the "Index." May 1, 1873.
33. No legislating for temperance! July 10, 1873.
34. Spain --- Cuba. December 1, 1873.
35. Letter to George T. Downing. March 6, 1874.
36. Woman's war upon the dramshops. ch 24, 1874.
37. The Bible for "total abstinence." ay 14, 1874.
38. Civil rights bill and West Point Academy. June 27, 1874.
39. Our first duty is to keep down the democracy. Sept. 8, 1874.
40. Every vote for Mr. Tilden helps bring ruin. October 1, 1874.
41. "To thyself be true!" November 23, 1874.
42. Will the American people cease to oppress? December 12, 1874.
43. Gerritt Smith for Grant. Speech to neighbors June 22.

GERRIT SMITH ON SUFFRAGE.

HIS SPEECH IN THE CAPITOL, ALBANY, FEBRUARY 28TH 1856.

Gentlemen of the Legislature,

The negro is calling on you to help him recover the right of suffrage. Ought you to help him? You ought, provided the negro is a man:—and provided, too, that suffrage is a natural and inherent right—a right belonging to a man because he is a man.

The negro is a man. If this is difficult of proof, it is only because the proposition is self-evident:—only because the truth of it shines of its own sufficient light. To speak of the negro, as the great poet speaks of the Jew:—"Hath not a negro eyes? hath not a negro hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a white man is? If you prick him does he not bleed? If you tickle him does he not laugh? If you poison him, does he not die? If you wrong him, shall he not revenge?"

Frederick Douglass is a negro. His voice has recently sounded within these walls. Was there one of you, to whom it did not seem to be the voice of a man? And was there one of you, who doubted, that it was a human spirit, which prompted his deep and rich and noble voice? Thought any of you, that it was not the soul of a man, from whose depths flowed out the eloquence, which moved and melted you? Is not Frederick Douglass every way a man?—a man in person, in understanding, in heart? In short, "are not the elements so mixed in him, that nature might stand up and say to all the world: This is a man?"

I proceed to assert, that suffrage is a natural and inherent right. From the fact, that the province of Government is to protect person and property, it follows irresistibly, that every man has the right to participate in choosing the officers of Government—in choosing those, who are to wield the powers of Government for the protection of person and property. For, besides that every man has a person to protect, every man either has, or may have, property to protect. I say every man—the foreigner as well as the native—the black as well as the white. What! says the Native American party—would you have the foreigner vote, before he has been in the country twenty one years? Yes, I would. What! say the other political parties—would you have him vote before he has been here five years? Yes, I would. I would have him vote, ere he has been here five years, or three years, or even two years. Wherever his home is, there has a person the right to vote:—and, I add, that every person may make his home, wherever he pleases. The whole world is open to his choice.

All, therefore, that I would ask of the foreigner to entitle him to vote in America is sufficient evidence, that he has made America his home. His solemn declaration to this effect, if coupled with no more than a year's residence among us, is sufficient.

But I shall be told, that the foreigner cannot learn to vote right, until he has lived among us twenty one years—or, at the very least, five years. It does not, however, lie in the mouth of our native-born citizens to tell me so, seeing that foreigners vote quite as properly as they do. The mass of our native-born citizens are ever ready to vote for profane swearers and rum-drinkers and rum-sellers and demagogues and slaveholders:—and I really do not see how foreigners can well do worse. The truth is, this clamor against the ignorant and corrupt voting of foreigners is the veriest affectation, that ever was. Do they not vote for the same men we vote for? Are they any more ready to vote for bad men than we are? And when the day shall come (Heaven speed it!) that our native-born citizens shall vote for none but sober, honest, pure-minded men, will not foreigners be found just as ready to vote with them then, as they are to vote with them now? The disease in the body politic, of which our native-born citizens complain, is emphatically in themselves. "Physician, heal thyself!" Let our natives vote right, and our foreigners will vote right.

I pass on to the question—why the black man should not be allowed to vote as well as the white man? Are not person and property as dear to the black man as to the white man? Surely they are:—and surely, therefore, he has as good right as the white man to take part in choosing the official or Governmental protectors of person and property. Are the rights of the black man inferior to, or less sacred, than the rights of the white man? We need but to drink in the idea of the human brotherhood to know, that the rights of all its members are equal in extent and sacredness. The idea of the human brotherhood!—so truthful, so beautiful—and yet so unwelcome! How the pride of the heart revolts and scorns it! Nevertheless, all around us men fancy, that they are democrats and christians. It is but a fancy. There never was a democrat—there never was a christian—who did not practically recognize the human brotherhood, and who did not see under a red or a black skin, as well as under a white one, his own equal brother. Why, the doctrine, that all men are the children of a common Father—are brothers and equals—is the very first lesson both in the school of democracy and in the school of Christ. If we have never learned that lesson, we may be sure, that our democracy and christianity are spurious.

Why is it that we are so especially slow to accord his rights to the negro? It is because we are especially prejudiced against him. The negro race still furnishes the recruits and victims of slavery. Hence, a black skin is the badge of a servile and disgraceful condition. It is such a badge, even where the unhappy wearer of it is not in slavery. So the black man bond or free, the degradation and disgrace of slavery are reflected upon him. Here then, in the actual enslavement of a part of his race, and in the dishonorable association of his whole race with slavery, is to be found the origin of our prejudices against the negro. Innumerable are the ways, in which these prejudices are fostered and strengthened. There is time to notice but a few of them, and these only very hastily.

One of these ways is the custom of the negro-pew. I do not wonder at this custom;—for human pride is capable of any wickedness, of any meanness. But I confess, that I do wonder how they, who approve the negro-pew, can succeed in persuad-

ing themselves, that they are christians. Would Jesus Christ—would He, who washed the feet of His poor, ignorant, despised disciples—build negro-pews? No—and all reason and religion echo "no." Nothing can be more contrary to the heart of Christ. How then can they be christians, who build them? Vain is it to hope, that the prejudice against our colored brother will give way, so long as it finds this authoritative recognition and this vital support in the sanctuary.

Another of the innumerable ways, in which American christianity (a pretty christianity!) fortifies and perpetuates its prejudice against the black man, is refusing to bury him among white men. In some communities this christianity goes so far, as to provide in the title deeds of cemetery lots against such mingling of colors. Alas, what outrages on humanity—what outrages on christianity—are enacted in the name of christianity!

Other ways, in which this prejudice is countenanced and promoted by the strange religion of our country, are not letting the negro sit by our side in the jury-box, nor train by our side in the militia, nor eat by our side, nor associate with our families. We shun him even as the Jews shunned the leper. Nevertheless, we stick to it, that we are christians. Poor deluded mortals! we have not learned the first letter in the alphabet of christianity.

One of the most effective means for giving energy and malignity to the prejudice against our colored brother is the falsehood, that the bible sanctions slavery. Alas, what guilty and infamous uses that blessed book is put to! It is made the cover of slavery and war and rum-drinking, and the authority for degrading woman. In short, it is made to be the worst book in the world. The satanic and current interpretations put upon it make it the mightiest of all hinderences to the progress of civilization and christianity.

Perhaps nothing contributes more to uphold this prejudice than the admission of nearly the whole American people—yes, Republican party and all—that the slavery of the negro can be legalized, and that the Constitution does actually legalize it.—None of our office-holders would dare to say, that it would, or could, be legal to enslave any other race than the negro. If, for instance, they should dare to say, that it would, or could, be legal to enslave the Irish, they would soon be office-holders no longer. Their delightful occupation would soon be gone forever. How cruel, how deadly, to the Irish would it be to single them out as we do the negro race, and to admit, that they, though no other people, are capable of being the subjects of lawful slavery! But no less cruel, and no less deadly, to the negro race is our like admission against it.

What is slavery? It is an attempt, no less blasphemous than absurd, to reduce the image of God to brutehood—to transmute immortality into property. No statute in behalf of this attempt; no Constitution in behalf of it; can relieve it, in any degree, of its blasphemy and absurdity; can impart to it, in any degree, the sanction of law. Not until you can have a valid and obligatory law for enslaving God, can you have a valid and obligatory law for enslaving man. Again, all law is for the protection of rights. But slavery annihilates all rights. It is not the office of slavery to protect a man, but to unman him.

The Constitution could not legalize slavery, if it would. It could no more speak man into a brute, than it could speak stone into wood, or wood into stone. But where in that Paper is there one line in favor of slavery? I know, that we continually read and hear of its compromises in favor of slavery. But where are they? I cannot see them. It is true, that I am not a lawyer, and have not the discernment of a lawyer. Perhaps there is a lawyer present, who will point out these compromises. I pause to give him opportunity to do so. [Mr. Smith paused in vain.] No, there is not one word in that Paper for slavery. Apply to it the legal rules of interpretation just as all the Courts apply them to all other legal instruments, and not one word for slavery can be got from the Constitution. But were it ever so full of favor to slavery, there could be no *law* in it for slavery. There can be no law for slavery, if for no other reason than that no one can honestly administer a law for slavery. No one would have slavery held to be a law against himself:—and hence no one can be honest in holding it to be a law against another.

Another and most fruitful source of nourishment and growth to this prejudice against the black man is the American Colonization Society, which is impudently asking your aid at the present time. I know that Society well. Not many years after its organization, and but a few years after I came to manhood, I joined it. Like many others, I joined it with the spirit and the hopes of an abolitionist. For many years I gave much of my time to it. I wrote for it, and spoke for it; and, so intense was my interest in it, that my gifts to its treasury were limited only by my ability.

I said, that I know the American Colonization Society. It was not however until 1834 and 1835, that I came to know it. In those years the abolitionists drew forth its character. Milton's toad started up a devil at the touch of Ithuriel's spear: and when the abolitionists fell upon the Colonization Society, it could no longer disguise itself. It stood revealed in all its grim ugliness. Then it was, that it took the ground: "No emancipation without expatriation". Then it was, that it denounced abolition, but had no censures for slavery or slaveholders. I was an abolitionist. I had always been an immediate abolitionist. How could I do less than turn away from the Colonization Society forever? I left in it many men, whom I honored and loved. Some of them remain in it still. I cast no reproaches upon them. They see the matter with their own and not with my eyes. They think, that I erred in leaving the Society. I think, that they err in remaining in it.

How frightful, not to say how fatal, to the free colored people is the attitude of that Society! It virtually says to them: "Here you shall have no home; here you shall not be allowed to strike your roots in the soil; here the avenues to knowledge, respectability, usefulness, happiness shall be closed against you; here you shall be outcasts from society, and without rights in the body politic; here you shall be ridiculed, despised, loathed, persecuted, oppressed." It is true, that the Society professes to say all this in love. It says it, not because it hates the free colored people, but because it believes, that if they will not all this drive them to Africa, they will, in the end, be far better off than had they remained here.

No wonder, that the free people of color hate the Colonization Society. No wonder, that they feel themselves to be deeply, cruelly, murderously wronged by it. No wonder, seeing how full it is of great and influential names both in Church and State, that these poor outraged ones are well nigh falling and perishing before its mighty influence—before the storms of hatred and contempt, which it succeeds in raising against them.

Suppose such a strong Society were organized against our Germans, and that one part of these people were free, and the other enslaved; and suppose, too, that the most influential purpose of many of its members were to drive back to Germany the free part because it is a source of dangerous disaffection to the enslaved part; and suppose, moreover, that this Society were to take the ground, that America is not the country to afford homes and rights and privileges to Germans—would you not, my German friends, regard such a Society as your most hateful, wicked, injurious foe? Can you doubt, that you would. If such a Society is organized, will you, at its bidding, leave your poor brethren in slavery, and go back to Fatherland? Say, will you? Wollen Sie auf Vaterland zuruckgehen? I anticipate your prompt and indignant answer: "No, no, we will *not* go back."—"Nein, nein, wir wollen *nicht* zuruckgehen."

For the free Germans to consent in such circumstances to return to Germany would be to make the German name a reproach to the end of the earth and to the end of time. And why, pray, should our black men be any more willing than our Germans to desert their enslaved brothers and sisters? Our Germans would, in the supposed case, spill their blood rather than turn their backs upon their crushed kindred. So, I trust, would our black men. Never must they leave this country:—certainly never until their enslaved brethren shall be allowed to go with them. Those black men disgrace themselves and their race, and disgrace human nature, who quit America, in order to better their fortunes elsewhere, and who desert their own bruised and bleeding people to identify themselves with another people. But such instances will be few. The mass of free blacks (already half a million) will remain. In all probability they are destined to play no mean part in the battle to be waged in this land between liberty and slavery. That battle, it is to be feared, will be fought not with moral weapons only, but with literal weapons also: for there seems not to be virtue enough left to bring American slavery to a bloodless end.

The only other means of maintaining and increasing the prejudice against our colored brethren to which there is time to advert, is depriving them of the right of suffrage. Having robbed them of this right, we despise them because they are without it. Having cheapened and degraded them by shutting them away from the ballot-box, we pronounce them unworthy of respect, and worthy only of contempt. Although it is by our own hands, that they have been cast down, we are nevertheless unreasonable and wicked and cruel enough to scorn them because they are down, and to justify our scorn by the fact, that they are down. Hence it is, that our colored brethren, in asking to be relieved of their disfranchisement, ask to be relieved of one of the most efficient causes of their degredation—of one of the most efficient causes of that tide of contempt and hatred, which sets against them every where, and overwhelms them every where.

Time was when our religion was less a caste-religion than it now is:—for, under the first Constitution of our State, the black man was allowed to vote on the same terms as the white man. It is true, that we let the property of the black man vote now, provided he have enough of it. The white man is allowed to vote in virtue of his bare manhood:—but the black man only in virtue of his property. What absurdities a people are driven into by their wickedness! What fools their pride and prejudice make of them!

It is time to end my Speech. I beg you to do your part toward restoring to the black man the right of suffrage. I beg it for your own sake. Doubtless you participate in the general, the almost universal, prejudice against him. Nevertheless you are not so swayed and blinded by it, as to be unable to see, that suffrage belongs to men irrespective of their complexion:—and, if you are not so swayed and blinded, you will sin fearfully against your own souls, in refusing to help the black man recover this great essential right.

I have begged, for your own sake, that you would do your duty in this case. I beg it for our whole white population:—for, throughout nearly the whole of it, the spirit of caste prevails. Against this spirit you would war effectively by doing what you could to reinvest the black man with the right of suffrage; and against this spirit you and I and all of us are bound to war in every practicable and possible way. For it is a mean, and hateful, and devilish spirit. It darkens and dwarfs the understanding. It debases and shrivels the soul. Others suffer and perish from its venomous and murderous aims:—but the reflex influence of those aims upon him, who cherishes it, is more certain and more deadly. Mighty and ceaseless then are to be our efforts to deliver ourselves and to deliver others from this most evil of all evil spirits.

I have begged you for your own sake, and also for the sake of your white brethren. I now beg you, for the sake of the free colored man, to help him regain the right of suffrage. He greatly needs it. He is in perishing need of it. This depriving him of a great right of our common humanity—how it unmans him in the sight of others!—and, what is so much worse, how it unmans him in his own sight! Had the Constitution of your State but told the black man, that he is too ignorant, and too vicious, to be allowed to vote, he could have borne it—unjust as it would be to tell him so, and not to speak likewise to many a white man;—for if for these reasons many a black man is unfit to vote, so also for these reasons is many a white man unfit to vote. That injustice, I repeat it, he could have borne. But what he cannot bear is that the Constitution should impeach and disgrace his origin. He could bear to be proscribed for his own abuse of his nature, be the abuse justly or unjustly alleged. But to be proscribed for that nature itself is what he cannot bear. Thus, however, does the Constitution proscribe him, when it tells him, that he is unfit to vote because he is born black—unfit to vote, because his nature unfits him to vote. It is such a proscription of the black man by the organic law of the State, that very greatly favors the policy, and strengthens the habit, of despising, and trampling on, the black man. It is this attack of the Constitution on the very nature of the black man, that encourages and stimulates the public sentiment to drive its iron deeper into his soul. It is this, which contributes, quite as much as any of his wrongs, to sink him in his own esteem, and to lead his despairing spirit to question whether he was made a man or a brute. Let us hasten then, gentlemen, to give back the right of suffrage to the black man. When he gets that right, his sad heart will begin to hope, and his fallen head will begin to rise; and when that right returns to him, other rights, of which he has been robbed, will soon follow it.

I have plead with you for your own sake, and for your white brethren's sake, and for the free colored man's sake, to restore to him the right of suffrage. I now plead with you to do it for the slave's sake. The slaveholder contends, that slavery is the fit, and the only fit, condition of black men; and for proof he triumphantly cites their degraded condition at the North. But that degraded condition is owing to wicked laws and a wicked public sentiment. When we repeal those laws and correct that sentiment, the black men among us will rise:—and they will rise to teach the slaveholder, that he can no longer prove any thing for slavery by their condition and character. They will rise an overwhelming argument against slavery, and will shame and terrify the slaveholder out of his slaveholding by the force of their redemption and elevation. Nothing is more true, than that Southern slavery is strong or weak in proportion as the condition of the Northern blacks is degraded or improved. When the slaveholder shall see the Northern blacks to be men, they will see their slaves to be men; and when they shall see their slaves to be men, the rod of the oppressor will fall to the ground and the oppressed will go free.

I shall have done, when I have asked you, for the honor of our great common Father, to render this measure of justice to the black man. In His great heart there is no caste, no prejudice. With Him all the races of men are His equal, and equally dear, children. In the Heaven, which he has built for the righteous, there is no caste, no prejudice; and He can be honored here below only so far as the spirit of Heaven is here below. To the extent, however, that the children of men hate and wrong each other, earth is hell; and, only so far as they acknowledge each other, as brothers, is earth Heaven. For the honor of God then, let us hasten to restore the right of suffrage to the black man, and to set before the world so influential an example of the triumph of justice and love.

EXTRACT FROM HIS SPEECH IN MILWAUKIE JUNE 17 1857.

By the way, wrong views of the title to citizenship are not confined to the Supreme Court of the United States, nor to slaveholders, nor to Proslavery men. There are many Antislavery men, and even many Abolitionists, who share in them. Citizenship, like voting, is a natural right; and hence all who assume to create it are guilty of supplanting the claims of nature

with their own uncalled-for creations. They who make the right to vote in our country turn on a certain amount of learning, or on several years' personal acquaintance with our institutions, give but too much countenance to those who make the color of the skin a disqualification for voting, or for citizenship. Both in the one case and the other—though I admit more flagrantly in the one than the other—principle is violated, and a precedent is set for further and indefinite restrictions on natural rights. Too long have the people consented to receive as franchises, or Government-conferred privileges, what is inherent and God-given.—Resolving natural rights into privileges has, in every age of the world, been a trick of tyrants. Privileges they can bestow or withhold at pleasure, and alas, the people will be only thankful for such as they get. When the emigrant has afforded proof of making America his home (surely a single year's residence among us is proof enough of that), Government is not then to *make* him a voter and citizen, but simply to *recognize* him as such. In whatever country a man has his home, there he has a natural right to citizenship, and to the ballot-box, ay, and to the soil also—just as natural as to life, and light, and air. Despotisms will continue to cover the earth as long as the people consent to surrender their natural rights in exchange for grants from Government; and despotisms will disappear from the earth as soon as the people shall insist on confining Government to its limits, and shall assert their own natural right to all that falls outside of these narrow limits.

EXTRACT FROM HIS SPEECH IN CONGRESS APRIL 6 1854.

I am opposed to the bill for organizing the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas, which has come to us from the Senate, because, in the first place, it insults colored men, and the Maker of all men, by limiting suffrage to white men. I am opposed to it, because, in the second place, it limits suffrage to persons, who have acquired citizenship. The man, who comes to us from a foreign land, and declares his intention to make his home among us, and acts in harmony with such declaration, is well entitled to vote with us. He has given one great evidence of possessing an American heart, which our native could not give. For, whilst our native became an American by the accident of birth, the emigrant became one by choice. For, whilst our native may be an American, not from any preference for America, the emigrant has proved, that he prefers our country to every other.

EXTRACT FROM THE ADDRESS REPORTED BY HIM IN BUFFALO JUNE 14 1848.

Compared with other countries, the right of suffrage is, indeed, greatly extended in our own. But even here, how far is it from being universally enjoyed! Multitudes, for no better reason, than the color of their skin, are excluded from it. And neither here, nor in any other part of the world, is the right of suffrage allowed to extend beyond one of the sexes. This universal exclusion of woman, still more than does the withholding of legal protection from her rights of property, and still more, even, than does the withholding of those rights themselves, argues, conclusively, that, not as yet, is there one nation so far emerged from barbarism, and so far practically Christian, as to permit woman to rise up to the one level of the human family. It also argues, conclusively, that Civil Government, notwithstanding its intrinsic character is in the fullest harmony with the most honorable conceptions of female purity and delicacy, is, nevertheless, so, unhappily confounded with those flagrant forms of injustice and brutality, to which it is perverted, as to make the thought of woman's participation in it revolting and absurd.

(Mr. Smith is compelled by his theory of Civil Government to admit women to the ballot-box. He believes that the sole province of Civil Government is to protect persons and property. Hence he believes that the only legitimate object of men in choosing civil rulers is to choose protectors of person and property. But women as well as men have a person and property to protect. Why then should not women as well as men be allowed to vote?)

SPEECH OF GERRIT SMITH

IN THE

KANSAS MEETING, AT THE CAPITOL IN ALBANY,

March 13th 1856.

I deeply regret, that Mr. Thayer, whom we all hoped to hear, has not yet arrived. He is the President of the New England Emigrant Aid Society: and I wish he were here, were it only, that he might improve the occasion in vindicating that much aspersed, but nevertheless highly judicious, liberal, honorable and useful Society. By the kindness of Governor Clark, I have, since coming into this Hall, been permitted to read a communication, which he has just received from Missouri. We learn from this communication, that they have actually begun to organize Emigrant Aid Societies in that State also. But how different are they from the New England Society! A Missouri Society offers a large bounty to those, who will become actual inhabitants of Kansas, provided expressly however, that they are "proslavery." The New England Society, on the contrary, give no bounty to any. It gives information and advice impartially to all, who wish to emigrate to Kansas, and it builds mills and hotels in Kansas for the equal accommodation of all, be they proslavery or antislavery. Surely, it is with an ill grace, that they, who see nothing wrong in one of these Missouri Societies, should impute officiousness and unfairness to the New England Society.

But to my subject. I will say nothing just now of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, except to say, that the repeal was very perfidious and very wicked. And but little need he said on this occasion of the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty." That doctrine is absurd, because, inasmuch as a Territory belongs to the whole people of the United States, they the whole people are bound to govern it. It is not competent for them to abdicate, and to leave to a handful what belongs to all. They have no right in such case to substitute another government for their own.

It is, however, entirely immaterial to the purposes of this meeting whether "squatter sovereignty" is right or wrong, or whether the repeal of the Missouri Compromise is right or wrong. Enough for this meeting to know is the condition and wrongs of the people of Kansas. What is that condition, and what are those wrongs? As the gentleman from Kansas (Gen'l Shankland) has described them to you, I need not go into an extended account of them.

The people of Kansas went to that surpassingly fertile and beautiful portion of the earth to find homes for themselves.—They then undertook to make a government for themselves. But a parcel of unmitigated and desperate scoundrels in Missouri, under the lead of such fellows as Atchison and Stringfellow, were determined, that the people of Kansas should not make a government for themselves. They, these scoundrels, would make it for them. Accordingly they marched into Kansas. I say marched—for, in many cases, they entered Kansas in a military conquering style, with drums beating and flags flying. They took possession of the ballot-boxes, and elected whom they would. Instead of a Kansas government, a Missouri or border ruffian government was set up in Kansas. That a government, brought into being in this wise, should enact the most diabolical and infamous statutes, is not to be wondered at. A specimen of these statutes is that, which makes it a penitentiary offence to express an opinion against the rightfulness of slaveholding. The border ruffians now insisted, that the people of Kansas should obey these statutes, and be loyally subject to the government, which had been forced upon them. The people of Kansas could but refuse. To have yielded would have been to prove themselves to be little less base than their oppressors. It was now, that these oppressors marched an army into Kansas to enforce subjection. But, as General Shankland has told us, their whiskey gave out—and with it their courage. Moreover, what they heard of a new kind of rifle in the hands of the brave men of Kansas—a kind invented by one Sharp—produced a great quaking among them. At any rate, so it was, that they marched back again. All this time the Federal Administration—the powers at Washington—had done nothing, and said nothing, openly. Beyond doubt, however, they were all this time countenancing and encouraging the outrages, of which we have spoken. And now when the terror-stricken border ruffians had fallen back, the Administration came forward with its messages, and proclamations, and threats. I will not say, that it came forward to embolden the ruffians to a fresh invasion; nor to take their place: but I will say, that it came forward to do their work—the work of compelling submission to this foreign and ruffian government. Hitherto the Administration had been loud for the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty," and for the right of every people to govern themselves—even the handful, that might be scattered over a broad National territory. In their eyes the chief glory of the Nebraska Bill was this doctrine. But now this slavery-serving Administration trampled this doctrine under foot, and utterly repudiated in practice what it had so ardently clung to in theory. For, now, it demanded, in the name of all the military power of the nation, that the people of Kansas should submit to a government, not chosen by themselves, but forced upon them by others. In this wicked and cruel demand it still perseveres. Wicked and cruel I say—for not only does it know, that the government in question is a sheer and shameless usurpation; but it also knows, that the statutes of this government cannot be obeyed—cannot be endured—by any in whose bosoms there is the least spark of self respect, the least vestige of manhood.

Such then is the unhappy condition to which the people of Kansas are reduced—such the wrongs, which they are suffering at the hands of the Federal Administration and the Missouri ruffians. And the sole terms, on which these combined powers will consent to let the people of Kansas remain in Kansas—nay, will consent to let them live—is that they shall acknowledge this impudent and abominable despotism, which has been set up on their soil, and that they shall pollute their souls by perjury, and debase and extinguish their manhood by submitting to whatever their oppressors may lay upon them.

I hear one thing of the people of Kansas, which I am sorry to hear. I hope it is not true. It is, that they shall be willing to submit to this ruffian government, provided the Federal Government shall require them to do so. But in no event must they submit to it. They must resist it, even if in doing so they have to resist both Congress and President. And we must stand by them in their resistance. Let us bring the case home to ourselves. Suppose the legislature, who meet in this building, were to enact a statute depriving us of the freedom of speech, and making it a penitentiary offence to express an opinion against the rightfulness of slaveholding—would we submit to the statute? No, we would rather march into this building, and hurl from their seats the men guilty of such a perversion of their official powers. And we would be no less prompt to do this, even though all the Congresses and Presidents on earth were backing them. Surely, surely, in the light of the past we are forbidden to

indulge a blind veneration for an American Congress or an American President. It is but little more than five years, since an American Congress passed the Fugitive slave bill, and an American President signed it—yes; that same Millard Fillmore, that same shameless servant of the slave-power, for whom we are now called on to vote. How unequalled the impudence, how matchless the insult, of asking us, who believe in the fatherhood of God and in the brotherhood of man, to vote for him, who from his high place of power called authoritatively on the American people to plunge poor innocent men, women and children into the hell of slavery! Perhaps, in some parts of the State, there may be found persons base enough to obey this call. But not so in my part of the State. There we pour contempt upon the Fugitive slave statute, and trample it under foot. There, when put to the test, we know no law for slavery. There we are "Jerry rescuers". We took poor Jerry out of the strong hands of the Government; knocked off his irons; and walked him over that statute as over so much white paper.

No, the people of Kansas must make no more concessions to the slave power. They have made one; and that they must hasten to recal. For the sake of peace with that power, and of gaining its favor, they have voted to shut out the free colored man from their territory. But the people of Kansas need to retain God. This, however, no people can do, who proscribe and ostracize their brother. God goes with the wronged and outcast: and the men, who vote away freedom, or suffrage, or a home from the black man, vote away God from themselves. All this will be seen as in sunbeams, as soon as the true christianity shall have taken the place of our conventional and spurious christianity.

I referred to the violation of the Missouri Compromise. That violation was indeed ineffably treacherous, ineffably base,—But, after all, it was not one of the most lamentable of things. On the contrary, it may turn out in its results to be one of the best things. In my speech on the floor of Congress against the Nebraska bill (If the egotism of such a reference can be pardoned,) I likened slavery to the greedy dog in the fable, who, on opening his mouth to seize another piece of meat, lost in the deceitful stream the piece he already had: and I predicted, that slavery would lose its present dominion in grasping after more. There are multiplying indications at the present time, that this prediction will be fulfilled. Slavery, instead of finding in Kansas a reinvigorated and new life—a wide field, in which to repeat its horrors and achieve its greatest triumphs, is not improbably destined to meet there with defeat and death. Yes, Kansas may prove to be the grave of American slavery. The tide of war, once set in motion there, as the maddened slave-power seems intent it shall be, and it will rise and rise, and never subside, until it shall have overwhelmed and swept away the whole of American slavery.

I said, that the violation of the Missouri Compromise was not one of the most lamentable things. There was another thing infinitely more lamentable—and that was the enactment, the establishment, of that Compromise. There, was the great mistake of our fathers. They should not have permitted liberty to make a bargain with slavery. They should have sternly held, that slavery is incompetent to be a party to any bargain. They should have denied it all legal existence; and not only all right to do, but all right to be. They should have known slavery only as a piracy and outlaw—the most stupendous and atrocious piracy—the most unqualified and naked outlaw. A farmer finds a wolf in his sheepfold. Is he to propose a compromise with him, and to let the devourer have one half the sheep, provided he will stipulate to leave the other half unharmed? No, all will agree, that the farmer is, at once, to take the ground, that a wolf, in the light of the uniformly and excessively bad character of wolves, is a gentleman not to be bargained with, because a gentleman not to be trusted in any bargain, and not fit to be a party to any bargain. All will acquiesce in the farmer's conclusion, that a wolf has but one right—and that is the right to be killed. Just that one right, and only that one right, has slavery—the right to be killed. And the people of the North, in letting slavery live, and in making bargains with it, act no less absurdly than would the farmer, who should treat with, and share with, the wolf. What folly to suppose, that slavery can be appeased by the concessions of liberty! Give up to the wolf one half of the flock, and his feasting on that will but make him the more eager for the other half. So too is it, that every concession we make to slavery but whets its appetite for another. Certainly, so far as slavery is concerned, the people of the North have proved themselves to be exceedingly credulous and silly. They rival the idolaters and flatterers of old King Canute. Those simpletons believed, that even the waves of the sea would obey the voice of their king; and great was their astonishment at finding, that they would not. From time to time, the people of the North have told slavery, that it might come so far, but no farther;—and when they have seen it coming on, instead of stopping, keep coming, they have been as much astonished at its disobedience, as were the subjects of Canute at the disobedience of the sea. The simple truth is, that, so long as you tolerate slavery, its surges and encroachments are no more to be controlled than the surges and encroachments of the sea.

Yes, the compromise, that liberty made with slavery in 1820 was most disastrous to liberty. It was the first compromise between those powers in the history of our country. I do not forget how generally it is believed, that a compromise between them is to be found in the Constitution. How strange it is, that the people of the North should so generally have come to take the slaveholders' interpretation of the Constitution for the Constitution itself! Apply to that instrument the legal rules of interpretation, and you will not find in it one word for slavery, nor indeed one word on the subject of slavery. How could slavery get into that instrument, in spite of the manifest determination of its framers to have the instrument wear a clean and fair face for liberty? And what right have we to assume, that, if the Constitution had been expressly, clearly and certainly in favor of slavery, the people would have adopted it? I say expressly, clearly, and certainly—because slavery is matchless injustice, and because no paper, if legally interpreted, is for injustice, unless the injustice is open and avowed, unmistakeable and certain.

But I will say here by the way—that even if there is in the Constitution a bargain between liberty and slavery, liberty is released from keeping it for the simple reason, that slavery has broken it. If after the bargain, in which the foolish farmer has consented to divide with the wolf, the wolf is found among the farmer's half of the sheep, the farmer will be guilty of no perfidy, if in turn he goes among the wolf's half, and rescues all, that are left. Nay, the farmer will be no covenant-breaker, even if he shall, gun in hand, pursue the wolf into the very heart of wolfdom. On the same principle, even if there was the imputed bargain, is liberty entitled to pursue slavery:—for all that slavery asked, at the time of that imputed bargain, was but some twenty years, in which to prepare itself for a natural and easy death. Such, in that day, was the humble attitude of the monster, who, by means of his subsequent bold and ceaseless aggressions, is now in the ascendant!

I repeat it—the compromise of 1820 was the great, the fatal mistake. It was that, which indorsed, and dignified, and emboldened slavery. From that day to this slavery has felt itself to be a power in the land—an admitted and respectable power. Its claims to at least an equal standing and an equal share with liberty are put forth every where, and acknowledged every where. It is the *protege* and pet of the Federal Government. Even in its diplomatic correspondence with foreign nations, that Government is shameless enough to urge the claims, and provide for the protection, of slavery. The recent very able Address of the Republican party gives an instance of this prostitution of our diplomacy during the Administration of President Tyler. I am sorry to say, that repeated instances of it can be found in the Administration of even John Quincy Adams. It will surprise and perhaps offend some, who are present, to hear me say, as I am bound to say, that no Secretary of State ever used his office more industriously than did Henry Clay to uphold slavery. Not to speak of his negociations with the British

and Mexican Governments for the surrender of American slaves, it was he, who stopped the meditated invasion of Cuba by Colombia and Mexico. Those States were intent on expelling Spain from Cuba, emancipating her slaves, and republicanizing her institutions. But Mr. Clay, having reference to our slaves, gave those States to understand, that our Government could not quietly witness proceedings of so *contagious* an influence;—and that, in a word, such proceedings would be deemed by our Government a just cause of war. Our antislavery Whigs are very slow to believe, that a Whig slaveholder, and especially Henry Clay, is as bad as a Democrat slaveholder. But they must outgrow this prejudice, and open their eyes to the truth, that a slaveholder is a slaveholder, whether he be a Democrat or a Whig, or even a Henry Clay; and that, with few exceptions, the first purpose and the last purpose of every slaveholder is to uphold slavery.

I referred to the universal acknowledgment of the claims of slavery. This is true, even at the present time. Even now and notwithstanding all its recent outrages, we treat slavery as having rights—rights, that are to be most sacredly respected.—For instance, if we deny it the right to be in Kansas, we hurry to atone for the denial by admitting in the same breath, that it has the right to be in Missouri. It is by such admissions, that we lose all our power against slavery. If slavery has either the moral or legal right to be in Missouri, it has the same right to be in Kansas. If it can have a moral or legal right to be any where, it can have a moral or legal right to be every where. Would God, that a few of our Northern statesmen, who have a strong hold on the public confidence, had the earnestness and bravery to speak out what is in their hearts, and say, that slavery has not, and cannot have, either a moral or a legal right to be any where. Very soon then would it be in vain to look for it any where in this nation. The American people—I mean not only the mass of the Northern people, but a considerable share of the Southern whites also, are entirely ready to destroy slavery. All that they wait for is the leaders to lead them on to the work of destruction. What a pity, that some of our statesmen will not throw away their cowardly, calculating, cyphering caution, and bid the masses march!—not with bayonets in their hands, but with ballots. The right ballots could kill slavery this year. But delay a few years, and it will take bayonets to do it. It must be killed in one way or the other—and, that too ere long.—It was in the power of my noble and beloved friend Governor Chase to give slavery a death blow, the other day. If, when he learned, that Cincinnati was invaded by pirates and kidnappers, in their pursuit after innocent human prey, he had summoned a force to capture them, or to shoot them down if they did not surrender, neither Ohio, nor any other Free State, would ever again have been subject to a similar invasion. Such action on his part would have brought up the question distinctly and intelligently, whether there is in this nation such a thing as a State Government:—and whenever that question is thus brought up, American slavery will go to the wall, and America will be free. I said, whenever the question is brought up distinctly and *intelligently*—for a State Government, in any intelligent view of it, is one, that suffers no innocent person to be dragged from its soil. That deserves not the name of a civil government, which does not hold its shield constantly, faithfully, effectually over all within its jurisdiction—even the least baby, ay, the least black baby. That does not, necessarily, deserve the name of civil government, which protects such persons as ourselves—such persons, as crowd this chamber. For we, with our various powers and influences, can, in the main, protect ourselves. We need but little help from Government. That, and that only, is entitled to the name of civil government, which protects the humblest and obscurest—the poorest of the poor and the weakest of the weak.

But to return to the people of Kansas. Do we pity them? We do. Will we do for them what we can? We will. Were we in their circumstances and they in ours, we would have them limit their aid to us only by their ability. Let us pass the Resolutions before us, and give to the Committee what moneys we can, and go back to our respective neighbors and beg them to give likewise. Is it asked for what the money is needed? I answer, it is needed to buy bread for the people of Kansas—for their oppressions must have reduced many of them to poverty. When they should have been left to their industrious and peaceful pursuits, and to earn the means of their livelihood, they have been compelled to march to the relief of this, that, and the other threatened community; to muster in camps; to carry their arms by day; and to sleep upon them at night. The money is needed too to purchase the means of their defence. And it is also needed toward defraying the emigrating expenses of a part of the thousands of strong and brave men, who will, we trust, leave our State the present Spring to become actual, permanent, useful inhabitants of Kansas. I refer to that part of these thousands, who, because they have but little property, are entitled to our help.

I have done. I have spoken too long. I have made a speech, when the occasion hardly called for—hardly justified—a speech. We came together to raise money rather than to make and hear speeches;—not so much to give words to each other, as to give help to Kansas. It is a time to be sparing of our words, and free with our money. Let us now turn from talking to doing—to prompt as well as liberal doing. It should be prompt—for the necessity is present and certain, not prospective and doubtful. All that is most precious in Kansas—all that is most precious in the whole nation—is in imminent peril. What we do we should do quickly. "Now's the day and now's the hour."

Pepenneno, July 13th 1860.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS,

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I am frequently asked what the friends of Temperance and Freedom should do at the approaching Election. My answer is the same as that which for so many years I have given to the same question. *They should vote for the uncompromising enemies of the dramshop; and for those who, knowing no law for slavery, accord not the least legality to its least pretensions.*

The cause of Temperance is prostrate. Who prostrated it? Its professed friends. How? By trifling with it, and trampling it under foot at the polls. By voting for candidates whom they knew to be in favor of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors for a beverage. No man, who believes in the rightfulness of such sale, is fit for any political office. For the sole legitimate end of every such office is protection of the people: and hence they and they only, who love to be and study to be their protectors, are fit for such office. But are they such protectors, who license the dramshop, that manufactory not of drunkards and paupers only, but also of madmen, murderers and every other sort of criminals? Certainly not! As well might we elect slaveholders to political office. And how unfit they who buy and sell people are to be entrusted with the protection of the people, does surely not need to be argued. Nevertheless these friends of Temperance, yielding to other interests and partaking of the frenzy of party politics, rush to the polls to vote for drunkards and drunkard-makers. The rumseller himself is not a more responsible drunkard-maker than he who licenses him. And if here or there is an earnest man, whose conscience sternly forbids such prostitution of suffrage, he is scoffed at by these friends of Temperance as a fanatic or a fool. They are ever proclaiming that the dramshop is the greatest of all curses:—and yet they are ever voting to maintain it. Is this their matchless infatuation or their amazing hypocrisy?

A like treachery explains the like low condition of the antislavery cause. Abolitionists have from year to year voted against it until at last, there are fewer Abolitionists than there have been at any time within twenty years. The mass of those, who were once intent on abolishing slavery every where, do not go now for its abolition any where. The calculating policy of non-extension has taken the place of the uncompromising principle of abolition.

In the year 1844 more than sixty thousand men voted for James G. Birney. They would have refused to do so, had he not been opposed to the returning of fugitive slaves; to the continuance of slavery in the District of Columbia; to the continuance of the slave trade between the States; and to the admission of slave States. But ere four years had gone by another spirit had entered into them: and now even Martin Van Buren, with all his proslavery sins upon him, was fit to be voted for by men, who had so recently consecrated their votes to that repentant slaveholder—that sublimely pure and just man—James G. Birney. Of these sixty thousand probably not one thousand would now demand in their candidate the qualifications which they demanded in 1844. Who of all the sixty thousand would have voted as he did, had Birney avowed himself in favor of a white man's party, or of any however slight discrimination against the black man in the whole multitude of political rights? But now how very few of them all would withhold their votes from their candidate because of such an atheistic avowal on his part? I say *atheistic*—for what is plainer than that he who makes it does not believe in the God "who made of one blood all nations?" Very few of the sixty thousand but would now denounce a candidate as foolish or fanatical for placing himself on any of those high grounds on which Birney stood forth so openly and firmly and nobly. Now the sixty thousand call for cunning in their candidate. Then they insisted on integrity. Then the candidate must be grandly moral as well as grandly intellectual in order to be worthy of their votes. Now he must know how to shape his creed to the popular favor, and be skilled in contrivances to get votes. Thus increasingly rapid are the downward steps in morals.

What a mighty host would the sixty thousand have become had they not fallen into the fatal error of giving up truth for numbers! They were impatient for success—not knowing that they already had it, and would continue to have it so long as they adhered to principle. For not only is it true, that such adherence works out and surrounds itself with every success, but that it is itself the highest form of success. The sixty thousand had grown from seven thousand in four years. A far less ratio of progression would have put the Government of the country into their hands long ere this time. Evil was the hour in which they listened to the proposal to purchase speedy victory at the price of their principles. The price was paid. But no victory and no good came in return. Thanks for the eternal ordination that no good can be purchased at such a price!

The retrogradation of Northern Legislatures in respect to slavery illustrates the decline of Northern sentiment on that subject.

Vermont is acknowledged to be the most antislavery of all the States. But would her present Legislature resolve by even a bare majority in favor of abolishing the inter State slave trade; or slavery in the District of Columbia; or in favor of refusing the admission of new slave States? The disastrous effect of such Resolutions on the coming Election would be an effectual plea against them. Nevertheless in 1838 her Senate voted unanimously in favor of all these, and her Assembly by each an overwhelming acclamation, that no negatives were called for.

The only Anti-Slavery to be found in any of the present Parties is an unsteady opposition to the establishment of slavery in a Territory. Occasionally surrendered it must be also occasionally renewed to that end that an apparent, albeit well-nigh infinitesimal, difference may be kept up between the Republican and other Parties on the question of slavery. A Republican voter needs to hear and say something now and then against Territorial slavery, not only to prevent others from confounding him with a Douglass Democrat, but to preserve the hair's breadth difference in his own consciousness. At every other point than this of Territorial slavery all the Parties allow slavery its full swing. And how inconsistent and vain would be even an earnest and steady opposition to slavery at this point, if accompanied, as the present vacillating opposition is, by the admission that slavery may exist in a State—yea, in every State! For what is slavery but the practically asserted claim of property in man? And if the rightfulness of that claim in a State is conceded, it is virtually conceded in a Territory also. What is property any where is property every where. That "what the laws make property is property" is one of the things in the big bundle of atheisms. Property makes necessity for laws: but God alone ordains what is property. To the school of great Nature, and not to the enactments and conventions of men, are we to go to learn the elements and subjects of property. That Government may authorize the destruction of property in cases where it has become a source of actual or apprehended evil I do not deny. But to deny that this admitted power affords, as some maintain, ground for the claim that Government can transform into property that which is not property, and can look away from the light of nature, common sense, and common law to determine what is property. Perhaps instead of saying that Government may authorize the destruction of property, I had better said that it may authorize the destruction of that in which the rights of property are already forfeited or lost.

Would then any political party consistently and effectually oppose the introduction of slavery into a Territory, it must recall every admission it has made in favor of the lawfulness of slavery in a State. At this point of Territorial slavery the Anti-Squatter Sovereignty Democrats have on the score of consistency an immense advantage over the Republicans and Douglassites. If a man may be property in a State, it follows that he can be rightfully carried as property into a Territory. These Democrats make themselves strong by adopting this inference, and their opponents weaken themselves by rejecting it. But these Democrats would make themselves far stronger, if they would push their consistency further, and insist on the right to carry this man-property not only into any Territory but into every State also. And they will yet come to this, and bring the Nation to this, provided the Abolitionists do not succeed in the mean time with their counter doctrine that man is property no where. Either Jefferson Davis or Wendell Phillips is right. All between them, be it Mr. Douglass or Mr. Lincoln or whoever else, are wrong. If the being, made in the image of God, may be a slave any where, he may be a slave every where: and if not every where then nowhere. Vice President Breckenridge in his Letter of Acceptance just now published—a Letter by the way expressive of the high order of his cultivated mind—says: "Nothing less than sovereignty can destroy or impair the rights of persons or property." A sound proposition this, were the words "less than sovereignty" omitted. But a very unsound proposition is it, which sets sovereignty (human laws) above Nature and God. The rights of persons and property stand in Nature and God; and every invasion of them is sacrilege. The one legitimate function of Civil Government is to protect these rights in all their

original fullness and sacredness. But the Vice President is a slaveholder, and in self-defence he must assert the power of Civil Government to destroy the rights of persons. So too he must assert its power to destroy the rights of property, and to abolish slavery. For to abolish slavery is, as he holds, to destroy those rights: and he clearly sees that if Civil Government cannot abolish slavery, then upon his own principle it cannot create it.

The Vice President has made a mistake. The only position at this point on the side of slavery, which he could have taken with consistency, he has failed to take. In one breath he makes property in man to be as full as property in any thing else—as property "of whatever kind." In another breath he admits that the State can abolish property in man. What if his State should undertake to abolish property in the matchless blue grass fields around his Lexington, and in the highly improved breeds of cattle, that graze upon them—would he not resist such abolition? From what I personally know of his spirit and intelligence, I venture to affirm that none would be before him in declaring that God and Nature have said what is property, and that their authority is paramount to that of Kentucky. To have been consistent they he should not have admitted the right of the State to abolish property in man. He has admitted a distinction between slave property and other property; and if not so wide as that the Republicans claim, nor even so wide as that acknowledged by the Douglassites, sufficiently so nevertheless to give countenance to each, and to deprive his opposition to each of the dignity and force of a contest for a principle. The only contest for a principle at this point is that, which the Abolitionists are waging against Republicans, Democrats, Douglassites and all other enemies and despisers of human rights. The sound abolitionist tolerates in no circumstances the claim of property in man. He respects God, and cannot consent to sink to the level of brutes the being made in His image.

President Buchanan in his Speech of last Monday asks what he "as a Pennsylvanian would say or do" in case it should be contended that a Territory could outlaw iron or coal. And I ask him what he would say or do in case Pennsylvania herself should attempt such outlawry. If he is still a man—if the politician has not yet entirely consumed the man—he would promptly resist his State, and scout the idea of her power to strike down the rights of property. But, Mr. President, you did consent to her abolishing slavery—or, in other words, to her abolishing property in man. What then becomes of the basis doctrine of your Speech—that property is property—and that property in men is as sacred as any other property? The rights of property are as inviolable and indestructible as those of persons—and the justification of Pennsylvania for abolishing slavery is that she therein touched no rights of property!

Just here let me say that the Parties vastly overrate the importance of the petty issues between them. *The* battle is to be fought between the Slaveholders and the Abolitionists: and it will be fought just as soon as these Parties, that block the way, get out of the way. The result will be, not this or that condition, this or that liability, of a Territory;—but a Nation all-overspread with slavery, or all emptied of it. The result will be to give the lie to the "Declaration of Independence," or to honor its great doctrine, that "All men are created equal."

It is true that many members of the Republican Party believe slavery to be unconstitutional wherever the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction. But they all acquiesce in the proposition that this Government has no right to array itself against slavery in the States: and nearly all would accept the logical sequence that this Government is bound to protect State slavery from all foreign aggression. In a word all the Parties believe that the North is pledged by the Constitution, not only to return the fugitive slave, but even to march South for the defence of slavery. Truly, this is being pledged to the perpetration of enormous wickedness! For my own part I do not see that this pledge exists. But the North does: and hence her only wise and christian course is to entreat the South to liberate her from it either by consenting to change the Constitution at this point or by consenting to let her, the North, go out of the Union. Surely, the people of the South will not insist that we shall continue to trample upon our consciences and kill our souls by contributing to uphold a system, which, however innocent it may be in their eyes, is in our own more full of injustice to man and dishonor to God than any other on earth. Let the South do to the North as in an exchange of circumstances, she would have the North do to the South. What if the Northern States should adopt the policy of enslaving her light-haired people, and the South should then be holding as she does now, in common with the North, to the doctrine of the absolute right of a State, as against the National Government, to do what she will with her people!—she would, of course, regard herself as Constitutionally bound to uphold this policy. How deeply desirous therefore would she be to be released from all responsibility for it! For she would believe it to be an exceedingly wicked policy. Yet, what more wicked is it to enslave people because of their light hair than because of their dark skin?

I believe the Constitution to be antislavery. I believe, that it imposes no obligation upon me to uphold and fight for murder in Maryland or for the worse crime of slavery in Kentucky. But Constitution or no Constitution, I would have the North vote slavery to death. The North however believes the Constitution to be proslavery, and that whilst it remains unchanged such voting would be wrong. Again, I would have every slave run away from his master; and I would afford him every facility for his peaceful escape. I would tell him, as I have been telling him these twenty years, to "take the horse, the boat, the food, the clothing;" and to believe in no rights of property any where in the South as against his needs—nor indeed in the North either, so long as it continues to be to him, an "enemy's country." Let him take what he will, human life alone excepted. But the North, interpreting the right of the slaveholder to his slave to be a Constitutional right, and holding every Constitutional right to be sacredly inviolable and paramount to every other right whether in earth or heaven, cannot consistently put forth its hand in any way to deliver the slave.

I repeat then that the North, taking her or her own view of her obligations, has no other alternative than to cast herself upon the good feeling of the South, and petition for a change in the Constitution or a peaceable release from the Union. The right of such release—be it the release of the North or the South, the East or the West—I argued in my Speech in Congress on the Mexican Treaty. That right I hold to now: and that right I believe the South is just and generous enough to acknowledge. As you are aware, I am as ready to look South as North for justice, generosity and manliness. Do you say that the South is greatly corrupted by slavery? She is: but not more than the North. Slavery is upheld of the South in accordance with education. At the North in the face of education. The South believes it to be morally right to demand the return of fugitive slaves. The North believes it be morally wrong—Constitutionally right but morally wrong—to return them; and yet returns them. Is not the North then the more wicked—the more corrupted—of the two? Certain is it to my own mind, that the North bears a more corrupting relation to slavery than does the South.

Charles Sumner, that pure and brave and strong and learned man, does, in his Speech of day before yesterday in New York, distinctly convey the idea that the American Union is no more responsible for slavery in Charleston than in Constantinople. How otherwise could he put himself in line with the Republican Party?—especially after having shot so far ahead of it in his recent masterly Speech in Congress? But, it is impossible for my noble friend to bring himself into harmony with that Party. There is not room enough within its exceedingly narrow limits for a soul so great—so expanded by the love of truth—as is his. Even were there ground for his comparison between Charleston and Constantinople, he nevertheless could not be of that Party. But there is not the slightest ground for it. The Union is not bound to maintain any sort of Government in Constantinople. But it is bound to maintain "a republican form of government" in Charleston. It is not bound to put down insurrections in Constantinople. But it is bound to put them down in Charleston. Is slavery incompatible with republicanism, then the Union must put down slavery every where within the Union;—and so must it do if slavery has been or is sure to be the source of insurrections in any of the States. It must not permit the safety of a State, and through a State, the safety of the Union to be thus endangered by the existence of slavery.

Does Mr. Sumner admit that the Constitution tolerates slavery in the States? Then does he virtually admit that the whole Nation is bound to defend it—ay, in certain contingencies, to fight for it. Or does he deny that it is in the contemplation of the Constitution, that a State may so outrage all just conceptions of "a republican form of government," as to set up or continue slavery; or may furnish those frightful materials for "domestic violence" in which slavery abounds, then also does he virtually admit that the whole Nation is responsible for it—as responsible under the Constitution to abolish it, as in the former case it was responsible under the Constitution to maintain it.

Would that my dear friend might disembarrass himself of the few remaining hindrances in his glorious service of the cause of Freedom, and hasten to plant himself by the side of William Goodell, Lysander Spooner and those other Radical Abolitionists, who hold that the whole Nation is bound to shut out slavery from the whole Nation because the Constitution does so!

I have spoken of the duty of the North in the light of the convictions and admissions of the North. I hardly need say that I shall myself continue to go to the polls with a vote for men, who are not only anti-dramshop men, but who, knowing no law for slavery, treat as nullities whatever Courts, Constitutions or Legislatures may say in favor of it. My vote must continue to be for men who are content with and obedient to the law of heaven in respect to slavery. Increasingly disgusted as I am with the cant of the churches about christianity, I must nevertheless continue to go for christianity. I have no knowledge of Christ if it is possible that, in any circumstances, votes for rum men or slavery men can serve his cause or do him honor. I should be glad to vote at the coming Election for names presented by a Temperance and Abolition Convention: and I hope there will be such a Convention. But if there are not enough earnest Temperance men and Abolitionists left to get it up, I will endeavor to compose my ticket without the help of a Convention.

I trust that the stress, which I lay on voting, will not be construed to imply a censure of Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips and their noble associates. I still honor, as I always have done, the men who, differing broadly from myself in their interpretation of the Constitution, have conscience against voting under it.

I trust too that I shall not be regarded as seeing no merit in any who vote rum and slavery tickets. Many so vote, "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose." The longer I live the more am I convinced that men may be very good, and yet do things that I think to be very bad. They do not survey every subject from my standpoint. Again, though their steps, where diverging from my own, may not be as defensible as my own, nevertheless the end they have in view may be as good, and it may be cherished in a warmer and better heart. Even some of those, whose bad motto is: "The end justifies the means," may on the whole be better than some of those who are very scrupulous on the score of means.

To illustrate my position that a very bad deed may be combined with a character in which there is much good—there is nothing that in my eye is more unequivocally the work of Satan than casting back into the pit of slavery the poor brother or sister who has escaped from it. Nevertheless through the blinding power of a wrong education good men are drawn into this Satanic work. I know and respect Mr. Bell and Mr. Breckenridge. No little elevation and beauty of character mark them both:—and yet their life-long connection with slavery reconciles them to the recapture of the fugitive slave. So too from the like cause is General Houston reconciled to it. Nevertheless in regard to the wrongs done the Indian he is as tender as a woman. One can hardly fail in his social intercourse with the General to be pleased with him. Mr. Douglass too would have the flight of the slave arrested: and all the greater is the crime in him from his having been educated in Vermont and New York. But I have seen pleasant things in Mr. Douglass: and a relative of mine, who has long lived near him, told me years ago that Mr. Douglass is eminently kind to the sick and suffering around him. Alas, even the other Presidential candidate does also stand against, instead of by the side of, the poor trembling imploring fugitive! And yet, in respect to Temperance, Mr. Lincoln is reported to have a very clear vision. Moreover, no man has spoken more sublimely than himself on the "Declaration of Independence." How painful to see in one, who has so many claims to our respect and admiration, so wide a departure from justice and mercy!—and that too in the very case where justice and mercy are most called for!

But however worthy may be the gentlemen I have named, I must not vote for any one of them. However mitigated may be the crime of their proslavery by the misleading forces of their education and circumstances, I nevertheless am not permitted to vote in their darkness, but am bound to vote in my own light. Not their ignorance of the wickedness of slavery, but my knowledge of that wickedness, must govern my vote. My proslavery vote would not be excused at "the last day" on the ground that my candidate did not know the sin of slavery; but it would be condemned on the ground that I did know it.

Should any one of the five Presidential Candidates be elected, and I should see him applying his official powers to give back his brothers and sisters to the horrors and hell of slavery, I should be distressed. But had I voted for him I should die of remorse. For I should feel that his superlatively guilty work was my work—I having made it such in advance by my vote to give him the office, which I well knew he stood ready to use for this most diabolical purpose. In that case the summons of the President for military or naval aid to the kidnappers would be my summons, and the guilt of it would crimson my soul as well as his. For the stripes and tortures, that would await the returning captives, I, as well as he, would be responsible. Responsible I, as well as he, for their doom of a compelled and unrequited life-long toil. And the thought, that they were no more to have right to husband or wife, parent or child, and no more to be permitted to read the Bible or spell the name of Jesus, would be the excruciating thought, that to this possible and even probable end did I cast my vote, when I cast it for one, whom I knew to be in favor of consigning them to this fate. No, I must not vote for such an one. If others with their views can, I with mine cannot. If there are others who can afford it, nevertheless I cannot. Some there may be whose stock of righteousness is so large, that a balance would be left them even after voting (as does every voter for a slave-catching Presidential candidate) to set the whole army and navy of the United States against the innocent fugitive. But I have no such surplus goodness to vote upon: and therefore for me to cast such an unrighteous vote would be to reduce myself to utter and immediate moral insolvency.

Christian! were Jesus again on the earth, would you vote to have him lead the forces for returning the poor slave to the disabilities and tortures from which he had escaped? The bare proposition is most abhorrent to you. How then can you consent to vote for Mr. Douglass, or Mr. Lincoln, or any other man, who virtually tells you that he is willing to lead them? Has not party spirit blinded you? Nay, has it not corrupted you? What is too abominable for Christ to do is too abominable for any man to do: and thus would you yourself decide in every case where the spirit of Christ and not the spirit of Party prompted the decision.

I said that I must not vote for a slave-catcher. My profession of deep and tender interest in the slave is a life-long one. To turn now and vote against him—to vote that if he escape from chattelhood to manhood, he shall be thrown down again from manhood to chattelhood—would not that be giving an emphatic lie to this profession? Again, when men get to be as old as I am, they have an especial reason for not adding to the number of their sins—particularly of their great sins. Their "space for repentance" is reduced to a narrow one—too narrow to supply all the penitential tears, which even one such enormous sin, as voting a man back into slavery, calls for.

But I am asked whether I would withhold my vote from a candidate because I foresee one official wrong in him, and yet feel assured that he will be guilty of no other. Certainly, if that wrong is the murdering, or, what is worse, the enslaving of his fellow men. The wrong done to one man is not canceled by right dealing toward even all other men. Moreover, I am not at liberty to feel assured, that he who is pledged to commit the most flagrant injustice against one man will not, when as strong temptation calls for it, be guilty of as flagrant injustice toward other men.

There is but little hope for either Temperance or Freedom in our day. Too few of their present friends are their true friends. God grant that the next generation may have the wisdom, integrity and courage to vote away the Dramshop and Slavery! But in the mean time will not our land be more deluged with rum than it is even now? And (fearful question!) will it not also be deluged with the blood of the slaveholder and the slave? It does not follow that because four millions of slaves submit to the yoke, six or eight millions will.

How, indeed, can we hope for either of these great Causes in our day? The friends of Temperance would like to vote against Rum—but they love their Parties too well to do so. Politics have a far stronger hold than Temperance upon them. As to Slavery, the North does not dislike it enough to break away from all scruples and all Parties for the sake of voting against it: and neither North nor South is willing to come into the amicable arrangement of putting away Slavery by their consenting to share in the present loss of putting away the crime and curse for which both are equally responsible.

GERRIT SMITH.

NO TERMS WITH TRAITORS.

THE SUBMISSION OF THE REBELS THE SOLE CONDITION OF PEACE.

To the N. Y. State Democratic Committee,

I make no apology for criticising Democrats, since I am myself a Democrat. Nay, almost can I say: "If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in" Democracy, "I more." For I have spent much of my life in inculcating it. Moreover, my Democracy is not a half-way but an extreme one—a Democracy as broad as mankind; and so jealous of Government as to allow its presence not only not in the Church, but not in the School—nowhere indeed save in the one legitimate Governmental office of protecting persons and property. That mine is the genuine Democracy is manifested by the little patience, which the current and spurious Democracy has with it. Nor need I make an apology for praising Republicans, since I have never been one of them. And I need not fear that any thing that I shall say of Democrats or Republicans will expose me to the charge of office-seeking, since I am one of the few who, at the expense of being called very eccentric and very foolish, stornly refuse to go in the ways, which lead to office.

The proposition made to you a few days ago by the N. Y. State Republican Committee was both wise and magnanimous. It was wise in view of the wants of the country. It was magnanimous because coming from the stronger to the weaker Party. I regret that it was declined. Its prompt and cordial acceptance would have strengthened the hands of the Government, and brightened the prospects of patriotism. But there is a reason given for declining it, which I much more than regret. It merits abhorrence and denunciation intense and universal. Republicans, all, right-minded men, whether Republicans or Democrats, demand of the rebels immediate and unconditional submission. But you would have "the Federal Government hold out terms of peace and accommodation to the disovered States." Is this the policy of most of the Democratic leaders in the different States?—and is their Party to be rallied to espouse it? If so, then is there more reason than ever to fear the result of the war—of the war, which is waged so earnestly by our foes, and with so little and so divided heart by ourselves. Gloomy indeed is the prospect if even this little heart is to be made less and the breach in this divided heart to be made wider by this threatened unpatriotic attitude of the Democratic Party! Gloomy indeed the prospect if the great Party, which comprises nearly half the men of the North, is to exhibit such a spectacle of meanness as in its espousal of this policy it will!—such a spectacle for our foe to feed his pride and strengthen his courage and build his hopes upon!

The North would be left without spirit to continue the war after a proposed "accommodation" or compromise in her name. For what would the proposition imply but her admission that the rebels are at least partly right in their rebellion, and she at least partly wrong in resisting it?—what but her admission that our Government and Nation are either so reduced in power as not to be able to suppress a rebellion, or so reduced in dignity and self-respect as to be willing to bribe even rebels into forbearance? What in a word would the proposition imply but her admission that the Government and Nation are not worth preserving? For to treat with armed rebels is manifestly to throw both away. There is not a respectable Monarchy on earth that would consent to do so. But far rather might it treat with armed traitors than we—we who have an open, ballot-box, through which wrongs can be righted. Do you say that crimes may be committed by Government so enormous as to justify the wronged in passing by the tardy and uncertain remedy of the ballot-box to seize their arms? But if it is by such crimes, that this Rebellion has been provoked, then it should not be put down, and you ought to be ashamed of your boast that "hundreds of thousands of your (our) brethren (Democratic brethren) have taken up arms" against it. This boast is your virtual admission that the rebels had suffered no wrongs, which justified them in seeking any other than a peaceful redress. Never that I am aware had they suffered any wrong whatever at the hands of Government, always excepting the very great wrong of being allowed to have things their own way. Emphatically true is it that the South is our partial Government's spoiled child. And no less true is it that the North is now suffering the severe penalty of having permitted and encouraged the Government to spoil it.

A sword in one hand and a bribe in the other! We can never conquer in this wise. Possibly we might were our foe like ourselves. But neither of his hands bears messages of peace. Both are busy in dealing out death. And not only does he scorn to propose compromises, but he utterly and openly does he scorn to accept them. How exceedingly disingenuous in this light is your attempt and is every other attempt to make an issue with the uncompromising enemies of the Rebellion by proposing compromises! You know perfectly well that there can be no compromises. Nevertheless you continue to urge them. I will not say with the purpose—though it certainly is with no other effect than to divide and destroy us.

What boots it that we are two or three times as numerous as the enemy and have ten times his wealth, if we are divided, and he united?—if whilst with him all speak one language there are with us unmeaning lips, pen and presses that speak for him? Secession Regiments allowed to march daily through Baltimore would not be as dangerous to our Cause as are her Secession Presses. And similar is the danger of such Presses in New York. The Regiments could be watched and controlled; but the demoralizing influence of the Presses cannot be hindered from going over the whole land. These Presses plead their Constitutional rights! But just as sure as that the Southern Conspirators, who have flung away the Constitution and armed themselves against it and the nation, have no Constitutional rights, so sure is it that they, who remain among us and yet identify themselves with the Conspirators, have no Constitutional rights. There is not another nation on the earth, which would accord rights to persons in the circumstances of the conductors of these Presses: and this notion must either cease from such spurious and suicidal liberality or cease to live. The Constitution was not intended to afford protection to those who help on bloody war against itself and its loyal subjects. But what if there are Constitutional or other laws which seem to give shelter to such traitors? The necessities of war, among which there is scarcely one more urgent than the suppression of newspapers that are in the interest of the enemy, rise high above all laws. May the mob suppress them? No—but the War Power may. That Power, which has right to break up a bridge when in its judgment the measure is called for, has right under the same condition to break up a Press. But this you will say is to recognize in the War Power the boundlessness of despotic power. Admitted. And the nation which, in a war for its very existence, hesitates at such recognition, exhibits more of the harmlessness of child's play than of the terrible earnestness of war. What makes our comparatively small foe so effective? It is that the South is so earnest and so wise as to leave her War Power untrammeled, and entirely free to use all the means of the South and to use them as it will. This wicked war would soon have been ended had our Government or, in other words, our War Power felt the like liberty. Very different would have been the present condition of things if the Northern Government had felt the same liberty as the Southern to use black men. Whilst the South is wholly and hotly determined to maintain Southern Slavery and kill Northern Liberty, the North is half-heartedly in the work of maintaining both. The newspapers say that our Government has invited Garibaldi to take part in this impracticable and ridiculous work. It cannot be true. For though our Government may feel bound to pursue this wretched policy of going for Liberty and Slavery, it could never be guilty of insulting that grand Soldier of Freedom by inviting him to identify himself, his magnificent fortunes and his world-wide fame, with this wretched policy. Our Government will never invite Garibaldi to take part with it until it shall have risen to the purpose of conquering the enemy by whatever means. Not till then will he consent to take part with it.

By the way, is there not some danger that if the North shall continue her present unfriendly and contemptuous attitude towards the four and a half millions of Northern and Southern blacks, this attitude will, especially when combined with Southern professions and promises, have the effect to bring this mighty element into a sincere, and as appalling as sincere, identification with our foe?

Is it a wonder that every step of Jefferson Davis is confident and defiant, and that so many of Abraham Lincoln's are timid and hesitating? It is not. For whilst Jefferson Davis represents a people of one heart and one purpose, Abraham Lincoln is

[illegible] to pause and calculate how far and how fast such men as you and the masses you influence will let him go. [illegible]—for whilst the other President is cheered and strengthened by the entire devotion to his cause of all around him, our President is under the constant and withering remembrance that it will depend upon his success in conciliating the enemy at home whether the country will be able to conquer its other and less dangerous enemy. Simpleton that I was for believing that the shots at Fort Sumter would turn all the Republicans, yes and all the Democrats into Americans, and thus make the war a very short one! Having never worn the chains nor experienced the debauchment of party, I was ignorant how hard it is to break the one or get cured of the other.

You profess to be in favor of "the vigorous prosecution of the war". Of course you do. For the people are; and to get influence with them you must make them believe that you are. But there is only one way for you to be what you profess to be at this point. It is to help the Government carry on the war. But you point to "the hundreds of thousands" of Democrats in the Army to prove that you are helping the Government carry it on. In vain!—for this only proves that *they* are helping—not that *you* are. All honor to these "hundreds of thousands"! and all dishonor to you! Deeply do you wrong them, insultingly do you degrade them by identifying yourselves with them. In this dark hour of our country are they, like you, against its Government? No, they are fighting for it. Or do they, like you, refuse to co-operate with Republicans for the salvation of the country? No—God bless them! they rise far above such meanness and wickedness, [illegible] and shoulder to shoulder with Republicans. I cannot affirm that you will not succeed in bringing over the Democratic masses to your guilty ground. But I can affirm that you do not represent them now.

You do not fail to extol the Constitution. Of course not. Messrs. Breckenridge, May, Burnett, Vallandigham do not. For the politician not to extol it when his purpose is to gain something from Americans, would betray as great a lack of cunning as would the omission of the hypocrite to commend the Bible when he would gain something from christians. But, gentlemen, I trust an indignant public will teach you that the present is not the proper time for turning men's minds from the Country to the Constitution—from their urgent duties amidst the appalling necessities of the one to their composed study of the requirements and their prolonged admiration of the merits of the other. It is but a poor sort of philanthropy, which distresses itself over the great value of the clothes that the drowning man is carrying with him to the bottom. Very unseasonable is the reading of the "Rules of the Hotel" to its inmates, when the Hotel is on fire. But not more so than to remind Americans of the Rules of the Federal Constitution, when rebels are at their throats.

I do not expose myself to the charge of making light of the Constitution by setting the country above it. For much more have I written and much more have I spoken for it than has any other Democrat living or dead. And it is not for parts of the Constitution that I have written and spoken—but for every line and letter of it. And I have not dishonored the Constitution and its Authors by admitting it to be necessary to go outside of it for proof of its meaning. But I have honored both by insisting that it is its own sufficient interpreter.

The cry of "The Constitution! The Constitution!!" is at once the most hypocritical and mischievous of all the cries with which treason is filling the land. Our Government is earnestly and honestly intent on saving the nation; and it is for the life of the nation that our Government be confided in and sustained. Whoever then seeks to weaken its hands is a traitor. But of the most wicked and effective form of treason are they guilty who, taking advantage of the popular idolatry of the Constitution, unsettle the popular confidence in the Government by charging it with disregard of the Constitution.

I hope, gentlemen, that you are not traitors. But if you are not then are you greatly to be pitied for so strongly seeming to be what you are not. If you are not more concerned to conquer the Republican Party than to conquer the Rebels, then never did any men's attitude more belie their spirit. That your purpose is to inspire your Party with the deepest distrust of the Government is too obvious for even you to deny. That your success in this would complete the ruin of your country you may not see. Nevertheless you would see it, were you not blinded by party zeal. I think you will not succeed. I think you will not be able to carry with you the County and Town leaders of your Party, much less the Party itself. Strong as is the partisan spirit in your Party, I think the spirit of patriotism in it is stronger. I believe you will not be able to rally an Opposition Party at the North. As there is but one Party at the South, so there will be but one at the North. All the South is for the Rebellion, and all the North will be against it. I believe that the Government will stand, and that you will fail. I believe that the Democratic as well as the Republican Party will consent to postpone the prosecution of party purposes and the gratification of party predilections until the Rebellion shall be conquered and the country shall be safe. That done, and I shall be as willing to see each Party go its own way, as I shall be glad to see all the wrongs of the South (if there are any) abundantly redressed, when she shall have ceased from her Conspiracy and laid down her arms. But a curse on the Party that raises its head before the war is ended. And not one word of peace, nor one leaf of the olive-branch, nor one concession however small to the rebels so long as they are rebels. Much as they are worth, and they are worth much because they are our fellow men, the Government and the Nation are worth vastly more: and both Government and Nation will perish if there shall be the slightest stooping to those who are in arms against both.

You would have it understood that the Republican Party would consent to "the separation of the States". I confess that I preferred such separation, if peaceful, to war. But the Republican Party has never proposed it. There is not one Republican in one hundred who would consent to it. Moreover, there are ten Democrats who would, where there is one Republican who would.

I have not failed to notice that in your Call of the Convention you too put party below patriotism. But in vain is it that you do so. "Actions speak louder than words." Never, after you declined the generous No-Party Proposition of the Republicans, has it been in your power to profess yourselves to be above party and yet enjoy the reputation of being sincere. Your mistake was a great one. Cunning cannot correct it. The only remedy is your repentance.

GERRIT SMITH.

PETERBORO, *August* 13 1861.

GERRIT SMITH TO JOHN A. GURLEY.

PETERBORO, December 16 1861.

HON. J. A. GURLEY, M. C.,

DEAR SIR,

I have read a newspaper copy of the Bill which you submitted 9th instant to the House of Representatives. Nothing in it do I wish to speak of save its proposed assumption of special powers over liberated slaves.

I had hoped that among the good effects of the War would be the recognition of human rights under whatever skin, and the equalizing before the laws of the black and red races with the white race. But your Bill is among the indications that I had hoped for too much.

"Short accounts" is a favorite motto with men of business:—and they are quite right in outlawing such as have run beyond a few years. God also is for "short accounts," and for the prompt payment of balances. But where men refuse to deal with Him on this principle, He forbears not to go into long accounts with them and into reckonings that reach very far back. In His court no statute of limitations can be plead. When Jesus exclaimed: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate!"—when he thus exclaimed he referred not merely to her recent but also to her remote deeds of wickedness. Her centuries of now obstinating sins were now to result in her desolation. So too if desolation shall be the fate of our American "house," it will be the result not of a few hot of many sins, not of present provocations only but of past ones also. It takes a succession of guilty generations to bring about the destruction of a nation. There must be great crimes, long persisted in, and by multitudes too, ere the "iniquity" of a nation is "full." The killing of one prophet and the stoning of one messenger—the shooting of the prophet Lovejoy and the outrages upon the greater prophet Garrison and the seeking of the life of the eloquent messenger George Thompson—all this, ay and much more in the present like it, would not suffice to exhaust the patience of Him, who is "long-suffering" and "slow to anger." He would still exclaim: "How shall I give thee up?—my heart is turned within me—my repentings are kindled together." These are indeed counts in the indictment. But for other counts with which to fill up the long indictment He goes into the wide and distant past. It is not until the present generation has filled up the measure of national iniquity that the nation is destroyed. Then does God hold that generation responsible for the sins of the past generations also. And He does this on the clearly sound principle that by repeating those sins, and repeating them too in the instructive light of their appalling and destructive effects, it has virtually endorsed them and made them its own. The man who keeps the dram-shop or gambling-house, which his father and grandfather kept, is responsible for their sins as well as his own. By consenting to succeed them in an occupation which, whilst it was in their hands, he saw break hearts and multiply paupers and criminals, he adds to the guilt of its effects in his own hands the guilt of its like effects in theirs. It was on the same principle which rules in this case that Jesus held his generation guilty, not only of the blood of its slain prophets, but of "the blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world."

Before passing on to make application of this principle to our guilty country, let me remark that I do not forget that what I call divine judgments many call the avengings of nature for the violations of her laws. Nevertheless what are these laws which so many put in the place of God, and construe into the shutting of God out of His own world? What are they but the uniform modes of His action?—the fixed and unchangeable ways in which He works? And how quickly would they cease to operate were He to cease to energize them!

The great sin of our country in all the periods of her existence, whether under Colonial or Constitutional rule, is the assumption of special powers by her white race over her other races: and on the principle adverted to we are guilty not only of our own but also of the past commissions of that sin. Moreover if this sin is now carried to its ultimate height, then is our nation now to be destroyed. That her doom: "Behold thy house is left unto thee desolate" is already pronounced, no man is warranted in saying—though every right-minded man sees signs enough of it to make him tremble. The breaking up of our nation is far more than begun: and so too is the march of her desolation. It may nevertheless have still left to it a space for repentance.

If, as we all believe, God has made of one blood all his children, then must this assumption, even when in small measure be a high crime against His equal fatherhood toward them all and against their equal brotherhood toward one another. His love of them all is equal; and from this results their obligation to acknowledge constantly and cordially the equal rights of each other. But if this assumption when so limited is nevertheless so criminal, how immeasurably criminal must it be when the assumption is beyond measure! The Indians we have driven from their homes and from their dead. The Indians we have slaughtered and, what is worse, enslaved. In the veins of tens of thousands of our slaves flows the blood of their enslaved Indian ancestors. To the negro, even more wronged than the Indian, we have spared nothing at all of his manhood. Exclusion from participation in political power and from all the rights of citizenship, unpaid toil and every insult, stripes and chains and death have been his portion at our unnatural, cruel and fratricidal hands. And can we still—even now when our nation is brought to the very brink of destruction, and brought to it so manifestly by pride in our own race and contempt and hatred of other races, and when too nothing short of the speediest and heartiest repentance can save it—can we, I ask, still continue to practise all or even any of our enormous wrongs against the Indians or the Negroes? I think that we cannot afford to. You think that we can. For your Bill provides that the liberated slaves, and in effect the whole black population of the country (for it will come to this if your Bill becomes a law and the nation exists long enough to let it operate to its fullest effect,) shall fall under the exercise not only of special but, compared with any thing short of slavery, exceedingly tyrannical powers. It provides that they shall be excluded from our political family, put under absolute dictatorship, torn from homes as dear to them as are ours to us, apprenticed without their will, admitted to only qualified rights of property, and so qualified as to pen them up forever in swampy, barren Florida, unless they shall be able to get themselves beyond the limits of unceasing and almost as universal as unceasing American hate. Yes, your Bill provides that in miserable Florida, where the general worthlessness of the soil is indicated by the sparseness of the population, our colored countrymen—our poor, peeled and persecuted brothers and sisters—shall be forcibly congregated, and put under the political rule of a handful of whites who, in such case, can hardly fail to become most terrible despots. Yes, it is in such circumstances that your Bill proposes to have the liberated slaves make their first allowed experiment in agriculture and in all material and moral improvement. The experiment must *necessarily* prove a failure: and the failure will afford a fresh occasion for ridiculing and despising negroes, and will be unfairly and meanly turned into an argument to justify the oppressions heaped upon them—all their former oppressions as well as those provided for in your Bill.

I know not that any others will protest against your Bill. But I must. By my love of God my love of man and my love of country, all of which are deeply wounded by it, I must. It will bring our poor country into fresh perils. It will be a fresh crime against our colored brethren, and a fresh insult to their Maker.

Why, dear Sir, could you not have framed a Bill, which would provide an easier lot for these brethren? Do you reply that their former one was much harder? I rejoin that the harder was that the easier should be this. Under the righteous doctrine of recompenses we should, if we could, make their condition now as much happier than that of others as it was before more miserable. All the greater is this obligation because our Government was responsible for this more miserable condition—the received and acted-on interpretation of the Constitution making the Government the great watch-dog of slavery.

I might reasonably ask Congress to do much for the liberated slaves. I content myself however with asking it simply to recognize their manhood, and withhold from them no civil nor political rights which it accords to others. For what else they

shall lack to begin their life of freedom I will trust to private benevolence and to an endless variety of help outside the Government. But would I let such ignorant men vote? Certainly, if other men as ignorant are allowed to. If the right of suffrage is denied to others who cannot write nor read, then, I admit, it should also be denied to such liberated slaves as cannot. But would I let them go where they please? The same right of locomotion would I acknowledge in them as in others. But they will be lazy unless they are compelled to work! Well, what if they will? Surely no others have so good an excuse for being lazy as those who all their life-time have been compelled to work, and that too without wages. But would I not have them punished for laziness? Certainly not unless others are. And would I let them intermarry with the whites? That is a personal and private matter with which neither Congress nor any other lawmakers have aught to do. Nevertheless I am free to say that I see no objection to a colored lady's accepting the hand of a white gentleman provided she can possibly surmount her prejudices against his complexion. But another objection to granting the liberated slaves the rights of men, is that they will then rise up and kill the whites. They will be not a thousandth part as likely to do so, as if the rights had been withheld. I have not heard of a single instance since their full restoration to manhood in which West India black men have murdered white men.

I am not opposed to the colonizing of either small or large portions of our colored people. But unless we are prepared to acknowledge their equal rights and to place them on the same civil and political plane with the whites, the colony should by all means be outside of the nation. If within it, and the population composed chiefly of those who according to your Bill will be but Pariahs, it will be a very inconvenient not to say very perilous incongruity. I prefer the President's Message and Mr. Trumbull's Bill at this point to your Bill. There was great merit in the plan submitted by Mr. Blair a few years ago. It contemplated, if I recollect, no less than full civil and political rights for the colonists. The colony, it is true, was to be somewhere outside of the nation. But this in then existing circumstances was unavoidable. Slavery, which is now mortally wounded and rapidly dying, was then in vigorous life: and the slaveholders would not allow a black colony within the national limits. Ere passing from this subject let me admit that, in my judgment were the laws of nature allowed free play, the dark-skinned races would find their homes within and the light-skinned races without the tropics. But in all justice let the dark-skinned be left as free to refuse to migrate to the tropics as the light-skinned to refuse to migrate from them.

In all our provisions for the liberated slaves our especial aim should be to have them contented. A war of races (by far the worst of all wars,) is to be constantly and sedulously avoided. We are to remember that there are twelve or fifteen millions of negroes on this Continent and the neighboring Islands; and that through the force of her deep repentance for her enormous wrongs against poor Africa and her children Christendom will ere long be brought into the strongest and tenderest sympathy with all negroes. The day is fast coming when the negroes will be the especial care of many self-accusing and remorseful nations. It was Swedenborg, if I remember, who predicted that the "celestial people" would be discovered in Africa. If but a fancy it is nevertheless a very pleasant one, that the ministries of penitent Christendom will be among God's appointed means for fashioning that "celestial people." If the twelve or fifteen millions to whom I have referred are not yet a formidable foe, nevertheless unless we prevent it by just and generous dealing with them they will become such to our posterity. Flatter not yourself that our emancipated slaves will be contented in an apprenticeship. Those of the British Islands were not. Never were they more discontented: and hence the British Government hastened to take them out of it. But you will argue that your plan will bring contentment to the apprentices because it will bring wages to them. I, on the contrary, will argue that it will thereby bring additional discontent. From a false philosophy and a superficial view is it argued that men will be contented in proportion to the rights they get. A truer and deeper insight teaches that the more of their rights they get, provided they get not all of them, the more are they discontented.

> "The prisoner sent to breathe fresh air,
> And blessed with Liberty again,
> Would mourn were he condemned to wear
> *One* link of all his former chain."

Do not suppose that I argue from your Bill your lack of kind feeling toward the negroes. Anything which in your judgment would subserve their interests and yet be compatible with the safety of the whites would, I doubt not, have your favor. But you were probably educated to believe that one result of their unqualified freedom would be their violence and crimes against the whites. Under the like mistake were they who, both in Britain and America, predicted that the British Islands would run blood in the event of the emancipation of their slaves. They did not know how affectionate, how patient, and how slow to revenge the negro race is. They could not conceive that men, who had suffered such immeasurable wrongs at the hands of the whites, would in their new-born freedom and new-born power prove so harmless to them—and that too when the whites were, compared with themselves, but a powerless handful. Under the like mistake was it that several American vessels lying in the harbor of one of those Islands hurried to sea the day before the Law of Emancipation went into effect. So strong was the apprehension that destruction would sweep over the Islands the next day. And you have probably never given your attention to the facts which prove that when you have blessed the negro with his freedom he is satisfied and studies henceforth not to harm, but out of a grateful and loving heart to serve you. Moreover you were probably educated to believe that liberated negro slaves, unless continued in some degree of subjection to the whites, must prove unable to take care of themselves. Nevertheless there is the testimony of the British Islands to the fact that few people have ever made as rapid progress as their emancipated slaves in knowledge virtue and wealth. That the slaveholders and their allies and tools have been able to make Christendom believe that British Emancipation is a failure is perhaps the most striking instance ever known of the power and success of an oft-repeated and shamelessly persisted in lie. An utter lie is it—for in every aspect and every particular British Emancipation is a triumph and a blessing. The unquestionable facts to show this were only the last year, admirably put together in a pamphlet by Mrs. L. Maria Child. The painstaking and accuracy of this eminently wise and candid woman are too well known to need my commendation. I have just now ordered a copy of it to be sent to each member of both Houses of Congress. I know not how a right-minded person can read it and yet doubt the success of British Emancipation or yet doubt that our slaves, who are far more intelligent than were the British slaves, would by their well-doing reflect high honor upon the policy which should free them.

How grand the opportunity that has come to Congress! May there be no lack of either wisdom or courage to improve it! The abolitionists had thought to persuade the nation to abolish slavery from high moral and religious considerations. But this great honor is denied them; and they must be content with however humble a place events assign them. It is now for Congress to abolish slavery as a military necessity. The slaveholders have themselves placed it at the disposal of Congress. May they not only abolish it, but have so much faith in truth, in human nature and in God as to trust the liberated slaves with all the rights of manhood! Then will these trusted ones enable us to make short work of the War. And then, when the War is ended, they will with the help of their Southern friends and also with the help of their more numerous Northern friends, (who by thousands will go down to dwell with them and be their teachers, counsellors and comforters and the guides of their self-help) make rapid progress in every right direction. And then will the whole nation feel joy and pride in the intelligence and morality of these pupils. And then too, with her great reluctance to spare their labor, she will feel that if they are to be colonized it must be because they themselves desire it rather than because the nation does.

Our unhappy country! How can it escape ruin! A portion of our politicians would even yet be glad to compromise—and of this portion some would compromise on even the New York Herald's terms of giving up all and accepting the Confederate Constitution. Another portion with the President at their head persist in regarding the Rebellion as but a riot—of rather unusually large dimensions it is true, but nevertheless a mere riot, and one that is to be quelled at our own convenience and in our most agreeable way, and especially without the disagreeable help of these vulgar blacks. The defeat of our immense Army on the Potomac may be necessary ere this contemptible riot shall swell upon the surprised sight of the President into the dignity of a war. Another portion of our politicians are amusing themselves with a variety of schemes among which is Colonization, and are thereby diverting attention from the great struggle which is entitled to undivided attention. Moreover, forgetting the direction in the Cookery Book that the hare must be caught before he is cooked, they are for colonizing before catching the blacks. And how we are ever to catch them if we continue to drive them from our camps and even to return them to the enemy, and persist in the policy of alienating them until the South shall be compelled to identify them with her cause by an act of Emancipation, I for one, cannot see. And then, what is worse than all, the whole mass of our politicians have with very few exceptions been trained to worship the Constitution, and to steer at that "higher law" whose "seat is the bosom of God." They agree with Senator Trumbull that not even by the necessities of war must we allow the Constitution to be jostled. They agree with him that: "We will have gained but little in suppressing the insurrection if it be at the expense of the Constitution." Such gentlemen as the Senator and the President would not have the country saved unless it can be saved by rules. God multi-

ply those who would have it saved any how! I confess my high estimate of the Constitution as a means of saving the Country; and I confess too that I see not wherein it needs to undergo the change of a line or letter to make it a more effective means. But I deeply desire to have every man feel that, whenever circumstances arise in which the Country and the Constitution can be stood by only at the expense of each other, the sacrifice must fall upon the Constitution. However precious to any one may be the Constitution as a means of saving the Country, let him still regard it as but a means, and then he will not consent to sacrifice the Country to the Constitution.

Alas, this immeasurable mistake of confounding the cry of "Constitution" with the inspiring name of our Country! When in this name there is sufficient to move every heart, what folly and insanity to be summoning our soldiers to battle in the name of the Constitution! Many of them have scarcely any idea of its origin or objects. Not one in one thousand of them have read it; and not one in ten thousand of them cares a fig for it.

But even if the Constitution be one worthy of worship as it is so extensively claimed to be, let us at least agree to desist from worshipping it until the country is saved. Great too as may be the benefit of your proposed Colonization let us at least agree to defer realizing it until the country is saved. Brilliant and novel too as is the President's idea of *swapping off* direct taxes for negroes, let him be content to joy in the bare *idea* until the country is saved. In the meantime let our statesmen and commanders be moving their countrymen by appeals, which are unspeakably more full of inspiration than are any or all of these things which I have enumerated. By no such things as these did Marco Bozzaris seek to animate his brave band. And why should not Americans as well as Greeks be allowed to forget all these, and be told:

"Strike—for your altars and your fires;
Strike—for the green graves of your sires;
God—and your native land!"

Although I had finished my letter I must now, in consequence of having just heard the important and painful news from England, withhold it from the printer until I can add a page or two to it.

Alas that this news should find us still embarrassed and still diddling with the negro question! Alas, that we should still have one War upon our hands while we are threatened with another! Had we as we should have done, disposed of this question at the beginning of the War, then would its beginning have been also its ending. If slavery was not, as it certainly was, the sole cause of the War, it nevertheless was that vulnerable spot in the foe at which we should have struck without a moment's delay. Instead of repelling the negroes bond and free by insults and cruel treatment, we could have brought them all to our side by simply inviting them to it. As it is, the War has grown into a very formidable one; and the threatened one growing out of it will be far more formidable. Whereas had we not acted insanely on the negro question, we should have dreaded neither. More than this, had we, as it was no easy to do, struck instant death into the first War, we should have escaped the threat of this second one.

For what is it that the English Press threatens us with War? It is for compelling the English ship to give up the Rebel Commissioners. So it says. This is the ostensible reason. But would not England—she who is so famous for clinging to no almost entirely unqualified and unlimited right of search—have done the same thing in like circumstances? If she would not, then she would not have been herself. Had a part of her home Counties revolted and sent a couple of her rebels to America for help, would she not have caught them if she could?—and in whatever circumstances they might have been found? If she says she would not, there is not on all the earth one "Jew Apella" so credulous as to believe her. If she confesses she would, then is she self-convicted, not only of trampling in her boundless dishonesty on the great and never-to-be-violated principle of doing as we would be done by, but of insulting us by claiming that we ought to be tame and base enough to forbear to do that which her self-respect and high spirit would prompt her to do.

But perhaps England would not have done as we did. Her naval Captains have however taken thousands of seamen from our ships—these Captains constituting themselves the sole accusers witnesses and judges in the cases. It was chiefly for such outrages that we declared War against her in 1812. The instance of the San Jacinto and Trent is not like these. In this instance there was no question, because no doubt, of personal identity. But I repeat that perhaps England would not have done as we did. In a case so aggravated she would, perhaps, may probably, have taken ship and all. By the way, it may be that we did act illegally in not seizing the ship as well as the rebels, and subjecting her to a formal trial. But if in this we fell into a mistake, could England be so mean as to make War upon us for it?—for a mistake which was prompted by a kind and generous regard for the comfort and interests of Englishmen? Surely if England is not noble enough to refuse to punish for *any* mere mistake, she is nevertheless not monstrous enough to punish for the mistake, which grew solely out of the desire to serve her.

But wherein have we harmed England in this matter? We have insulted her is the answer. We have not however intended to insult her: and an unintended insult is really no insult. If in my eagerness to overtake the man who has deeply injured me I run rudely through my neighbor's house, he will not only not accuse me of insulting him, but he will pardon as much to my very excusable eagerness as to leave but little ground of any kind of complaint against me. Surely if England were but to ask her own heart how she would feel toward men in her own bosom who without the slightest provocation were busy in breaking up her nation and in plundering and slaughtering her people, she would be more disposed to shed tears of pity for us than to make war upon us.

It is not possible that England will make War upon us for what we did to the Trent, and for doing which she has herself furnished us innumerable precedents. It is not possible that she will so ignore, nay so deny and dishonor her own history. I will not believe that England, whom I have ever loved and honored almost as if she were my own country, and who, whatever prejudiced and passionate American writers have written to the contrary, has hitherto, during our great and sore trial, done nothing through her Government nor through the great body of her people to justify the attempt by a portion (happily a very small and very unworthy portion) of our press to stir up our national feeling against her—I say I will not believe that this loved and honored England will make War upon us for a deed in which we intended her no wrong; in which so far as her own example is authority there is no wrong; and in which in the light of reason and as it will prove in the judgment of mankind there is no wrong. She could not make such a causeless War upon us without deeply and broadly blotting her own character and the character of modern civilization. But, after all, what better is our modern civilization than a mere blot and botch if the nation which is pre-eminently its exponent, can be guilty, and without the least real cause of provocation and upon pretexts as frivolous as they are false, of seeking to destroy a sister nation?—a sister nation too whose present embarrassments and distresses appeal so strongly to every good heart? Moreover, how little will it argue for the cause of human rights and popular institutions, if the nation which claims to be the chief champion of that cause, can wage so wicked a War upon a nation claiming no humbler relation to that precious cause.

What then do I hold that England should do in this case?

1st. Reprimand or more severely punish the Captain of the Trent for his very gross and very guilty violation of our rights in furnishing exceedingly important facilities to our enemy. This our Government should have promptly insisted on, and not have suffered England to get the start of us with her absurd counter claim. This is a case in which not we but England should have been made defendant. It is her Captain who is the real offender. Ours is at the most, but a nominal one. In the conduct of her Captain were the spirit and purpose, as well as the doing, of wrong. The conduct of ours on the contrary was prompted by the spirit and purpose of doing right; and if in any respect it was erroneous it was simply in regard to the *forms* of doing right. Moreover, the guilt of her Captain can be diminished by nothing that was seemingly or really guilty in ours. The criminality of taking the rebels into the Trent was none the less because of any mistakes which attended the getting of them out. Nevertheless England takes no action against him. Her policy is to have her guilty Captain lost sight of in her bluster about our innocent one. To screen the thief she cries: "Stop thief!" Her policy is to prevent us from getting the true issue before the public mind, by occupying it with her false one.

How preposterous is the claim of England to her right to make War because we took our rebellious subjects from her ship! The taking of them into her ship is the only thing in the case which can possibly furnish cause of War. *That*, unless amply apologized for, does in the light of International Law, furnish abundant cause of War.

Did ever hypocrisy and impudence go farther than in England's putting America on trial? Was there ever a more emphatic "putting of the saddle on the wrong horse?" I overtake the thief who has stolen my watch, and jerk it from his pocket. He turns to the people not to confess his theft, but to protest against my rudeness and to have me instead of himself regarded as the criminal.

[illegible] tried for having "breezed the [illegible] [illegible] if eaten sheep and shepherds too, [illegible] with horror. "What! eat another's [illegible] [illegible] afresh in their conscious innocence.

[illegible] has the brazen effrontery to appeal to our conscience with her trumped-up case. [illegible] of the parties in this instance needs conscience-quickening is no less certain than in the instance of the footpad and the traveller, whom he had robbed of his bags of gold. The poor traveller meekly asked for a few coins to defray his expenses homeward, "Take them from one of the bags," said the footpad with an air of chivalrous magnanimity. But on seeing the traveller take half a dozen instead of two or three, he exclaimed: "Why man! have you no conscience?" England, through her subject and servant, entered into a conspiracy against America: America, through her subject and servant, forbore to punish the wickedness, and simply stopped it. And yet England bids us to our conscience!

Why should England protect her Captain? Her Queen in her last May's Proclamation warned him that for doing what he has done he should "in no wise obtain any protection." He had full knowledge of the official character of the rebels, and at least inferential knowledge of their bearing dispatches with them. But besides that the whole spirit of it is against what he has done, her Proclamation specifies "officers" and "dispatches" in the list of what her subjects are prohibited to carry "for the use or service of either of the contending parties."

England did not protect the Captain of her Mail Steamer Teviot who, during our War with Mexico, was guilty of carrying the Mexican General Paredez. He was suspended. Why does she spare the Captain of the Trent? Is it because she has more sympathy with the Southern Confederacy than she had with Mexico?—and is therefore more tender toward him who serves the former than she was toward him who served the latter? But it will perhaps be said that we have not demanded satisfaction in this case as we did in that. England nevertheless knows that we are entitled to it: and that she is bound to satisfy us for the wrong she did us, before she complains of the way we took to save ourselves from the deep injury with which that great and guilty wrong threatened us. In this connexion I add that if upon her own principles and precedents the Captain of the Trent deserves punishment for what he did, she is estopped from magnifying into a grave offence our undoing what he did.

2d. The next thing which England should do is to give instructions, or rather to repeat those in the Queen's Proclamation, that no more rebel Commissioners be received into her vessels.

3d. And then she should inform us whether in the case of a vessel that shall hereafter offend in this wise, she would have us take the vessel itself, or take but the Commissioners. It is true that whatever her preference we would probably insist in every case in taking the vessel;—for it is not probable that we shall again expose ourselves in such a case to the charge of taking too little. It is however also true, that should she prefer our taking the vessel, we will *certainly* never take less.

But such instructions and information, although they would provide for future cases, would leave the present case unprovided for: and England might still say that she could not acquiesce in our having in this case taken the Commissioners instead of the vessel. What then? She ought to be content with the expression of our regret that we did not take the mode of her choice, and the more so as that mode could have been followed by no different result in respect to our getting possession of the Commissioners. But this might not ~~justify~~ satisfy her:—and what then? She should generously wait until this unnatural and horrid war is off our hands; and if the parties could not then agree they should submit the case to an Umpire. If however she should call for an Umpire *now*, then although the civilized world would think badly of her for it and our own nation be very slow to forgive her for it, I would nevertheless, in my abhorrence of all War, have our Government consent to an Umpire *now*. Nay, in the spirit of this abhorrence and for the sake of peace I would go much farther. If no other concession we could make would ~~justify~~ satisfy England, I would have our Government propose to surrender the rebels Mason and Slidell, in case the English Government would say distinctly and solemnly that it would not itself disturb neutral vessels having on board rebels who had gone out from England in quest of foreign aid to overturn the English Government. An ineffably base Government would it prove itself to be should it refuse to say this, and yet declare War on the ground of our capture of rebels who were on their way for foreign help to overturn our Government.

I spoke of my abhorrence of all War. Our life-long opponents of War find themselves unexpectedly in sympathy with mighty Armies. They have to confess that they never anticipated a Rebellion so vast. Still less did they ever anticipate that England would be guilty of coming to the help of such a satanic Rebellion.

I have said that England will not go to War with us in the case of the Trent. Nevertheless I am not without fear that her Government will be driven to declare War against us. The Government of no other nation (and this is honorable to England,) is more influenced by the people. By such an affair as the capture of Mason and Slidell the patriotism of the least-informed and superficial and excitable part of her people is easily and extensively wrought upon. With this part of her people the inviolability of the British flag is more than all earth besides. But it is not by that capture nor by those classes to whom it appeals with such peculiar power that the Government will be moved. If an irresistible pressure comes upon the Government it will come from those portions of the people who long for the cotton and the free trade of the South, and who have allowed themselves to get angry with the North by foolishly misconstruing our high Tariff (which is simply a necessary War measure) into a *hostile commercial measure*. The capture of Mason and Slidell will be only the pretext, not the provocation;—only the occasion not the cause of the War.

If England wishes to go to War with us for any wrongs we have done her she shall not have the chance—for we will promptly repair the wrongs at whatever sacrifice of property or pride. But if, as I still love and honor her too much to believe, she wishes to go to War with us at any rate, and chooses this our time of trouble as her time to make us an easy prey, then will she be gratified. It will be but fair however to advertise her that she must not take our fighting in the War with the rebels as a sample of what will be our fighting in the War with herself. The former is fooling. The latter will be fighting. On all subjects connected with slavery, and therefore in a War about slavery we Americans are fools. We cannot help it. We have worshipped the idol so long and so devoutly that when in its all-influential presence we cannot be men. The powers of our moral nature are, however not destroyed. They are but perverted. And such an outrage as the English Press threatens us with will restore their legitimate use. Our manhood is not dead. It but sleeps. And as it was when the Philistines fell upon the bound Samson that the Spirit of the Lord came to his help, so when the English shall fall upon the worse-bound Americans, this sleeping manhood will awake. And it will awake to assert itself not merely against the English but against the Rebels also. And it will do this mightily because it will at the same time be asserting itself against its own life-long degradations and the hateful cause of them. Let us but know that England, to whom we have done no wrong, has resolved to come to the help of the Pro-Slavery Rebellion, and our deep indignation against her combining with our deeper indignation against ourselves will arm us with the spirit and the power to snap the "cords" and "green withs" and "new ropes" with which Slavery has bound us, and to dash to the dust the foul idol whose worship has so demented and debased us. Yes, let us hear this month that England has declared War against us, and this month will witness our Proclamation of Liberty to every slave in the land. No thanks will be due her for the happy effect upon us of her Declaration of War. No thanks will be due her that the Declaration will have the effect to save us—to save us by making us Anti-Slavery. No more halfway measures and no more nonsense on the subject of slavery shall we then propose. There will be no more talk then of freeing one sort of slaves and continuing the other in slavery. But we shall then invite every negro in the land, bond and free, to identify himself "arm and soul" with our cause. And then there will be no more talk of *swapping off* taxes for negroes, and no more talk of colonizing and apprenticing them. Then we shall be eager to lift up the negroes into the enjoyment of all the rights of manhood, that so we may have in them *men* to stand by our side and help us make short work with the present War, and with that with which we are threatened.

Owing to the bewitching and debauching influence of slavery upon our whole nation there are, even in the Free States, divisions among us in regard to the present War. But should England so causelessly, cruelly and meanly force a War upon us, there will be no divisions among us in regard to that War:—nor indeed will there then be in regard to the other. And so deep and abiding will be our sense of her boundless injustice, that there will never be any among us to welcome propositions of Peace with England, until her War with us shall have reached the result of our subjugation or of her expulsion from every part of the Continent of North America. Moreover we shall rejoice to hear of the crushing of her power every where—for we shall feel that the nation which can be guilty of such a War is fit to govern no where—in the Eastern no more than in the Western Hemisphere.

Respectfully yours,

GERRIT SMITH.

GERRIT SMITH TO GEORGE THOMPSON.

6

ENGLAND NEEDS TO SOOTHE AMERICA.

PETERBORO, January 25th 1862.

Hon. GEORGE THOMPSON, *Ex Mem. British Parliament,*

MY DEAR SIR,

I have read your recent Speeches on "American Slavery and the Present Crisis." Not to speak of their other merits, they show great knowledge of American affairs and treat of them very temperately and judiciously.

It was well that you employed your rich and commanding eloquence to prevent England from making War upon America. I hope you will now employ it to prevent America from making War upon England. You need not come here for this purpose. Stay where you are: and labor with others to bring your Government and people to such a sense and expression of their deep wrong against mine, as shall serve to take from the American heart the hatred of England which rankles in it. I refer to nothing else in this wrong than what has grown out of the Trent matter;—for nothing else has made up any part of it. It is true that here and there was a sore displeasure with England for her sympathy with our Rebels. But this sympathy might not have been so general as to make England responsible for it. Or it might have been more seeming than real. Or if it was indeed real, nevertheless it was not an offence of the grade or character to get angry with.

I have impliedly predicted that America will declare War against England unless England shall prevent it. I scarcely need say that this prediction comes not of my wishes. I love England more than I love any other nation save my own. I cannot help the preference. A common lineage, language and literature are sufficient to account for it. Her heroes, scholars, philosophers, poets and philanthropists I feel to be my own. And whilst many say that her oppression of Ireland and her forcing of opium on the Chinese are just worthy of her, I view them to be unworthy of her. The emancipation of her slaves—that was an act worthy of her greatness and glory. I said that I love her. I add that my countrymen loved her. The tears they shed for her when she was struggling with her horrid East India Rebellion were sincere. The welcome they gave her young Prince for his own sake, for his good Mother's sake, and for dear old England's sake also, was unaffected and cordial. Moreover I am opposed to War: and by War I mean the bloody collision of nation with nation. Every such collision I hold to be unnecessary and wrong, both on one side and the other. In no case may a nation declare War: and she may safely conclude that the moral power of her calm but unyielding refusal to arm herself against a declaration of War will protect her from it. Again, should it turn out that there are nations so low in civilization and so insensible to restraining and reclaiming influences as to ignore or break through this power and fall upon her, nevertheless there would be far more and far mightier nations to come to her rescue. These would not only honor her for her Peace principles, but they would be prompt to resist every mean and guilty attempt to take advantage of them. Our poor War-cursed world waits for a nation to take this attitude. The nation so trustful in truth as to take it will find it not less safe than sublime, and will be followed in quick succession by her sister nations.

That I should be opposed to War and yet be in sympathy with our large Northern armies may possibly be an inconsistency. Believing however as I have ever done in the duty of Government to control its subjects, I am conscious of no inconsistency between my opposition to War and my sympathy with armies however large if their sole object is the quelling of domestic insurrections. If Russia would be willing to save unarmed France from armed England, it by no means follows that she would on the same or on any principle be willing to employ her forces in subduing a French Rebellion. France must take care of her own rebels. Every nation must like every family govern itself. The nation or family which cannot had better be broken up.

That whilst my loyal countrymen have with scarce an exception a stinging sense of this wrong done by England to America there is but a comparative handful of them unqualifiedly opposed to War, fully justifies my strong fear that America will make War upon England.

Is it strange that they should have this stinging sense? To be men they must have it. The Trent had made herself, both in deed and spirit, part and parcel of the great American Conspiracy. "The owner and agent and all her officers, including the Commander Williams, had knowledge of the assumed characters and purposes"* of the traitors whom she had taken on board. She was doing what she could to help on their mission of death to their country. And all this was in the face of the Queen's Proclamation, and in the face too of the punishment which the English Government had inflicted for the like offence when we were at war with Mexico. The San Jacinto overtook the Trent, and, out of kindness to her passengers, to English subjects and English interests, let her pass on after having taken the four traitors from her. England, on getting the news, did not punish the Trent but declared War against America. Her first and immediate measure was actual War. Troops and arms were hurried off to our coast. Instantly men were put in motion to kill us. We were not to learn her spirit from the tone of her diplomatic correspondence on the occasion, but from her military movements. "Actions speak louder than words." If a man takes off his coat and comes toward me with rolled-up sleeves and clinched fists, I shall not be comforted by his words however far less threatening they may be. I shall still believe that he will whip me if he can. England proposed no umpirage: invited no explanation: would not even wait to learn whether our Government approved the conduct of the San Jacinto. But with cannon loaded and matches lighted she stood demanding instant compliance with her peremptory terms. She did indeed wait to hear from us. But it was only that she might then decide whether to *stop* War. She had already *made* War.

This was oppression indeed: and it was very hard to bear. Nevertheless not so hard as the insult she combined with it. We know, and we know that she know, that had such rebels gone out from her to compass her destruction, she would, without any delay or hazard by forms and ceremonies, have caught them wherever she could and hung them. How keenly insulting to us was her arrogant position that our national dignity is not entitled to such prompt vindication as hers, and that our national safety falls immeasurably below her own in value and sacredness! She had neither forgotten nor regretted that she had taken thousands of entirely innocent men from our ships. What contempt then did she pour upon us when she virtually told us that she is so infinitely our superior, that we must not take from her ships so much as four men!—no, and not even if they are very guilty men! No doubt this is in her eye a fitting attitude for a nation of centuries of fame toward upstart America.

But I pass on to speak of our circumstances at the time England declared War against us. Would that she had been moved by them to pity us, instead of being tempted by them to oppress us! We were struggling under a Rebellion the mightiest ever known—and the wickedest ever known. It was very wicked because entirely unprovoked. Nay, whilst we had never encroached upon the rights of the Rebels, we had but seldom resisted their multiplied encroachments upon ours. Much more wicked however was the Rebellion because it was a Pro-Slavery one. Facts prove that it was a purely Pro-Slavery one. Not a single Free State was drawn into it. Eleven of the Slave States rushed into it: and the remaining four would have followed had they not been restrained by the fear of Federal troops. The different sections in them all sympathize with the Rebellion just in proportion to their respective interest in Slavery. Believe Kentucky, Missouri and Maryland of the presence of Federal troops, and they would instantly join the Rebellion. There are nominal slaveholders who care little or nothing for Slavery. But in all the land, North or South, there is not one man of the slaveholding spirit, who does not prefer the Rebellion with Slavery to the Union without Slavery. But enough to prove the Pro-Slavery character of the Rebellion is the intensely Pro-Slavery character of the Government which the Rebels organized—though it may be well to add that nothing less ostensible than the spirit of Slavery could have been sufficient to prompt men to so sustain a Rebellion. How preposterous for the Rebels to say, as they do for the purpose of winning Europe to their side, that our high Tariff was unendurable! It was not high when the Rebellion

* Secretary SEWARD to Lord LYONS.

[illegible] and you will find [illegible]

[illegible] and you will find [illegible]

[illegible] nothing to fear [illegible] of [illegible] not [illegible] millions of people by the success of the Rebellion, nevertheless, the element of weakness being eliminated from it, our nation will be far more powerful than it was before.

I assume, as you see, that the Rebellion is to be successful. Every portion of my country is very dear to me, and I have done what I could to save it from division. But the only measure by which it can be saved from it its rulers obstinately refuse to adopt. This only measure is the identifying of the five millions of negroes with our cause. Victories we shall soon achieve. But they will be no substitute for this measure. They will only make its speedy adoption the more necessary. For their tendency will be to drive the South to identify by an Act of Emancipation those five millions with her own cause. When she shall be hard-driven by these victories her fears will tell her and Europe will tell her to save herself by giving up Slavery. Would that we might anticipate her in this measure, and thus save the nation and bless its whole population, North and South, black and white! But from the day the President laid his hand on Fremont's Proclamation I have seen but little prospect of this good. Nay, when of late I have seen how smitten with blindness are our rulers in both Church and State and how few are the signs of repentance in either, I have strongly feared that it is too late to save our poor perishing nation—that no amount of human power, pervaded though it might be with the greatest human goodness and controlled withal by the highest human wisdom could save it. From the first I have had not the least doubt that the bombarding of Sumter was the killing of Slavery. But now I tremble with the apprehension that ETERNAL JUSTICE cannot be satisfied unless there be added to the freedom of the innocent slave the destruction of the guilty nation.

I have virtually said that whichever party wins the blacks wins the battle. Many think that we would proceed to conquer the South even after she had emancipated the slaves. But they are mistaken. We then could not conquer her if we would, and would not if we could. We should have neither the physical nor the moral power adequate to it. The sympathy of the world would be with the South. The contempt of the world would fall upon us. And must we come to this? Almost certainly. To ask Congress and the Cabinet, after all we have seen of them, to save us from this, would be scarcely more promising than to ask dead men to walk. As an instance of the deadness of our rulers to all the claims of patriotism and self respect, the Senate of the United States is, I fear, morally unable to expel that arrant and shameless traitor, Jesse D. Bright.

Let me again express the hope that the philanthropists of England will labor to restore the exchange of good feeling between her and America. Let them to this end seek to better the bearing of the English Press toward America. And let them explain to the English people that the base object of our Pro-Slavery Northern Press in irritating England is to involve her in a War with us for the advantage of Slavery and the South. But above all let them labor to convince England of her crime in declaring War against us. And that was a crime not against America only but against the cause of christian civilization also. If we did insult her, which we did not, she should not have tried to kill us for it. It is too late for a christian nation to go to War for a mere insult. When it shall be right in one man to kill another for having insulted him, then and not till then will it be right in a nation to allow a mere insult to drive her to War. Love, and not pride, should be the animating principle of every nation as well as of every individual.

You will mark that I have not, in any part of my letter, fallen in with the incessant American abuse of England for her lack of sympathy with the Anti-Slavery North. The North is not Anti-Slavery, emphatically not as she is seen through the action of her Government; and through that it is proper for England to see her and judge of her. In respect to her relations to Slavery the North is entitled not to the sympathy but only to the commiseration of England. However soundly Anti-Slavery England might be, consistency would not require her to have Anti-Slavery sympathy with the North. This much however I can say for the North—that a large and rapidly increasing share of her people are sincerely opposed to Slavery, and are filled with shame and sorrow because of her Slavery-bound rulers. Thousands of them are still toiling, as for many years they have been, under every reproach and at every sacrifice, to break the yoke of their enslaved brother, and to save their beloved country. The breaking of that yoke is indeed an inexpressibly dear object to such men as Garrison and Phillips. But there are none more concerned than they are for the salvation of their country. The love of human rights does not interfere with patriotism. Nay, it is because of this love, that whenever you find a patriot of the truest type you find him an abolitionist. The love of country, which he has in common with others, is fed and expanded in him by the love of universal man.

I have farther concessions to make in this connexion. I do not believe that England sympathizes with Slavery in our rebellious States or any where else: and I do not believe that her need of their cotton can drive her to break the blockade of their ports. But I am pained by the apprehension that she will recognize the Government which has within the last year been set up over those States. That I am pained by it is not because the recognition would tend to weaken the hands of the North in her present struggle. Whether she shall or shall not succeed in this struggle depends, (provided always that the nation is not too guilty to be saved,) not on any other nation, but on the simple question whether she shall or shall not allow Slavery to keep hinderances in her way. Her way cleared of them and she is saved. But with them remaining in it she is lost.

It is because this new Government is a Piracy, and the most guilty and horrid Piracy Earth ever knew, that I am distressed at the thought of England's recognition of it. The day which shall witness such recognition will witness England's mighty influence for evil and a sensible reduction of the moral power of the world. This new Government is sufficiently characterized when we have said that the great boast of its builders is that Slavery is its corner stone. Would God that England and all Europe, instead of letting this Slavery-demonized Confederacy into the sisterhood of nations, might be inspired to say, as said Daniel Webster of another habitation where Slavery was plying its horrid work: "Let it be purified, or let it be set aside from the christian world: let it be put out of the circle of human sympathies and human regards, and let civilized man henceforth have no communion with it!"

With great regard

your friend

GERRIT SMITH.

Parmamono October 6th 1862.

TO THE TOWN OF SMITHFIELD,

I wish to say a few words to you. I am sure that there will be no party prejudice in them. For during all the latter half of my life I have belonged to neither of the political parties. And, considering how inveterate and deeply established are my views of the high and holy office of Civil Government, it is in no degree probable that I ever shall belong to either of them. Nevertheless so important is the bearing of these parties on the country and on human welfare, that I continue to study their character and watch their steps.

During all this horrid War you have stood faithfully by your country. You have sent many of your sons to her defence. They have been in bloody fights. The body of the brave Captain, who fell with battle-cries upon his lips, has just been returned to you for burial. The bodies of other of your sons are mingling with Southern dust. To the recent calls for more soldiers you responded promptly, and in numbers exceeding your quota. But you are now asked to go with the Democratic Party at the approaching Election. What is your reply? If you do go, will it not be going from the side of your country to the side of her enemy? Is it not the Republican Party, that is on the side of the country?

I have been reading General Wadsworth's Speech of the 27th ultimo, and the pamphlet composed of Governor Seymour's Speeches of January 31st 1861 and September 10th 1862. I may with entire propriety call them the Speeches of the Republican and Democratic Parties, since these gentlemen are chosen to be the standard-bearers and representatives of these Parties. The choice is happy in more respects than one. The position of each candidate is too sharply defined to be mistaken. Moreover, on neither side can a vote be withheld on the ground that the candidate lacks talents, or attractive manners, or the virtues of private life. All these advantages have both candidates in an eminent degree.

In referring to the position of General Wadsworth and Governor Seymour—in other words to the position of the Parties of which they are the accepted exponents—I refer to nothing but the one question of the hour. What are the views of these gentlemen or of their Parties about any thing else is comparatively of no present concern. On the same principle that I subscribe to the motto *Inter arma silent leges*, do I care nothing just now about these views of political economy and civil government, which for a quarter of a century I had been urging so strenuously. Nor shall I ever care any thing more about them until my country is safe from these Southern and Northern traitors. Governor Seymour says much of the Constitution. But this is no time to say much of it. I, who have written so many papers and made so many speeches for the Constitution and none against it, can afford to risk misrepresentation and even to defy the impeachment of my motives in my declaration that when rebels are at its throat is no time for the nation to be studying the beauties or even the requirements of its Constitution. Moreover, the Governor does by his untimely praises of the Constitution give countenance to those innumerable traitors who have, all the way through the War, been hiding their treason under their artful and hypocritical eulogies upon that prostituted Paper. Save the Constitution in time of Peace. But in time of War save the Country with or without the Constitution. To be prating of Constitutional law in time of War savors of an unpatriotic, not to say of a traitorous heart. The Scotchman, John Hook, was for "the law" as well as for his beef. But Patrick Henry, who confronted him, was for the hungry soldiers and the imperilled country. The pretended mother was for the law, *precisely* as it fell from Solomon's lips. But the real mother was for the child, whatever might be the law. So too is the patriot for the country whatever the terms of the Constitution.

I said that my reference is to nothing else in the position of the Parties or their candidates than what relates to the question of the hour. This one question is—How shall the Rebellion be disposed of? The Democratic Party, through Governor Seymour, says that it should be disposed of by compromising with the Rebels. The Republican Party, through General Wadsworth, says that it must be disposed of by conquering them. But for a nation to compromise with an armed and causeless Rebellion is to lose itself:—to lose itself in the world's esteem and in its own esteem. A nation, whose unwronged subjects have armed themselves for its destruction, can save itself only by conquering them. In the light then of this difference we see the Republican Party to be the friend and savior of the country and the Democratic Party to be its enemy and destroyer.

And what an infernal compromise is that, which Governor Seymour is in favor of! In his plea for the South—for thus should the pamphlet composed of his two speeches be named—we find this compromise to be nothing short of Mr. Crittenden's proposition to extend, irrevocably constitutionalize, and eternize Slavery! Who can fathom the meanness and malignity of a plan to compose the difference between the guilty North and the guilty South at the still further expense of the innocent and long-outraged blacks? A third party is to be at the entire expense of this compromise:—a third party too, which had been robbed times without number; and which is to be robbed this time more extensively than ever, and with infinitely more effective securities than ever that the robbery shall never end! In what entire opposition to all this is General Wadsworth's counsel to have Slavery annihilated, root and branch! Here again then do we see that the Democratic Party is the dread, and the Republican Party the hope of the country.

I do not forget that Governor Seymour's justification for compromising in favor of Slavery is that our fathers did so. But surely this slaveholders' Rebellion should suffice to convince us, that even though it were our fathers who made the mistake, we ought not to copy it. I call it the slaveholders' Rebellion, notwithstanding that there is here and there a traitor, who affects to trace it to some other cause. But as well may he deny his own glaring treason as to deny that this is a slaveholders' Rebellion in which eleven of the Slave States are embarked, and in which the other four would be but for the dreaded presence of Federal troops, and against which Rebellion every one of the nineteen Free States (,20 including Western Virginia,) is sternly arrayed. What is more, the avowed occasion of the outbreaking of the Rebellion was the election of a President opposed to the extension of Slavery. Still more, the Rebels glory in making Slavery the corner-stone of their piratical nation.

Nor do I forget that Governor Seymour and his Party deny that it is Constitutional for us to abolish Slavery in the Rebel States. But what can be more preposterous than to plead Constitutional obligations in behalf of States which have abjured them

and tredden them under foot. The guilty rebel has nothing that the Government, against which he has rebelled, may not take when it needs to do so. This is true even of his life—more emphatically of his possessions.

I need not say that there are innumerable points of view in which the Republican policy of destroying Slavery is better than the Democratic policy of sparing and strengthening it. To only a few of them will I refer you—and that very briefly.

1st. We cannot put down the Rebels and save the country if we continue to let them have their slaves to help them carry on the Rebellion. [Four millions of slaves furnish more out-of-door laborers than eight millions of whites.] The Republicans have at last discovered their inability. They were told of it from the first by the Abolitionists—by the handful who have made the nature and might of Slavery their life-study. But these, in common with the prophets of every age, are held to be insane until time has verified their prophecies.

2d. Our nation will be increasingly subject to slaveholders' Rebellions if Slavery shall be suffered to continue. Let us now, whilst we can, save our children from them.

3d. It is certainly better to let the poor slaves go free, and enjoy conjugal and parental rights and the right to wages and instruction and the other rights of Freedom than to hold them in the disabilities and degradation and torments of Slavery. And it is better to encourage Spain and Brazil to abolish Slavery—ay, to compel them by the force of our good example to complete the deliverance of Christendom from Slavery—than to encourage them by our bad example to continue in the matchless crime against God and man. Let me not wrong Brazil. As yet she is an example to us. For she forbids the public sale of slaves and the separation of slave families; and she compels the master to free the slave at the price named by the magistrate. Moreover, her justice to the free colored man contrasts as much to her honor as to our shame with our outrages upon him.

Of course I do not mean to identify all Republicans with this good Republican policy of which I have spoken, nor all Democrats with this bad Democratic policy of which I have spoken. Some Republicans are in favor of a Compromise and even of Slavery, and are therefore acting with the Democratic Party. On the other hand many Democrats are sick of Slavery and intolerant of all Compromises, and are therefore acting with the Republican Party. These Democrats love their country more than their Party. They see Slavery to be destroying their country, and hence they cannot longer abide in a Party which upholds it. They did themselves bear with Slavery until they saw it make War upon their country: and then they could bear with it no longer.

When I read in Governor Seymour's Speech of October 1861: "If it is true that Slavery must be abolished to save this Union, then the people of the South should be allowed to withdraw themselves from that Government which cannot give them the protection guaranteed by its terms"—when, I say, I read this, I see him to be not only a Pro-Slavery man, but a Southern man, and utterly disentitled to the votes of Northern men. For remember that, at the very time he said this, the slaveholders were shedding our blood, and endeavoring to dismember the nation in order to make room for the extension and perpetuity of their accursed Slavery. For remember that it was at such a time that he held that they ought to be allowed to dismember it, unless we were still willing, after all its murderous work upon us, to protect—not merely to spare—but to "protect"—that accursed Slavery. On the other hand when I find General Wadsworth saying in the Speech to which I have referred, that "we must cast out the Devil (Slavery) which has tormented and disgraced us from the hour of our national birth", I believe him, in the light of such just words and of his whole life, to be entitled to the vote of every man in the State. I refer to his whole life—for I have known him from his childhood. But I am, at this moment, especially impressed with his modesty which had ever declined civil office; with his ability as a military commander and his bravery in battle; and with his liberal dispensation of the vast fortune, which came to him from his accomplished father and his lion-hearted uncle, General William Wadsworth, who was wounded in the battle of Queenston. The ship-load of corn, which he sent to famished Ireland, shows that his is the benevolence which is bounded neither by race nor nation.

There is at last hope, good hope, for our deeply endangered country. The President, who is both an able and an honest man, is doing his duty. He will do his whole duty. I regret that in his precious Proclamation, for which my whole heart blesses him, he should again give the rebels time in which to return to their allegiance. I regret that he makes Emancipation prospective instead of immediate, and that he does not extend it over the Border States also, as it is his clearly Constitutional right to do. There are many, who admit that the right in such a case is extra-Constitutional. This they should not do. The President, in his capacity of supreme military commander, has the Constitutional right to abolish Slavery or Apprenticeship or any thing else in any State where, in his judgment, the exigencies of War call for such abolition. On the other hand, the President has no right in virtue of his military command to do what many, and especially the most eager abolitionists, say he should do. For instance, they complain that he did not make justice to the negroes the motive and ground of his Heaven-inspired and immortal Proclamation. But as military commander he is to act with exclusive reference to the conquering of the rebels. Does he, in the march of his Army, take possession of a certain building? He is to do so not that he may submit it to a Justification on account of its having been gambled in since the year 1620. This might gratify his hatred of vice. But it is not to enable him to seek such gratification, that he is put at the head of the Army. He can rightly claim the building only because there is military need of it. So too, whilst as a man, he weeps over the wrongs of the Africans in this land since the year 1620, he is nevertheless in his military capacity to liberate them only because by liberating them he can promote the suppression of the Rebellion. Many abolitionists found great fault with the tenor of the President's Reply to Horace Greeley. I am among those who thought this reply to be, as a whole, sound in doctrine and argument and admirable in style.

I expressed my regret, that the Proclamation does not emancipate the slaves in the Border States also. It is in these States, that Slavery is the most full of danger to our Cause. For these States, whilst Slavery exists in them, will not only not be able to help the nation; but will need to be helped by the nation. And what is an immense disadvantage—it is on enemy's ground, that the nation will have to help them—wherever Slavery is—the incitement and pabulum of the Rebellion—being enemy's ground. A rebel force invading Kentucky could not be put down with half the ease that it could be, were Ohio the invaded State. In Ohio the national troops would be at home and among friends. In Kentucky they would be as in a foreign land, and among a people half of whom are open enemies and no small share of the other half but conditional friends.

I regretted too that the Emancipation is not immediate. Our Cause would be greatly embarrassed by the South's preceding us in an actual Emancipation. Moreover, our policy cannot be entirely defined and settled and therefore most effective, until our Emancipation has become actual. Nevertheless the President has done well. I repeat that he will do his whole duty. The people must encourage him to multiply his bold and righteous steps by sustaining him in those he has already taken. And there is no other way in which they can thus sustain him so effectively as by making the majority of James S. Wadsworth for the office of Governor of the Empire State exceed one hundred thousand.

Your friend and townsman

GERRIT SMITH.

THE TWO UNIONS.

The Democratic or Pro-Slavery Party is constantly crying for "The Union as it was"; and the Republican or Abolition Party also claims to be for "The Union as it was." How shall this be explained? By the fact that there are two such Unions. In the following extract from his Speech in Congress on the Nebraska Bill Gerrit Smith describes both. *October* 28 1862.

To speak against slavery in any manner, and, especially, in the national councils, is construed into hostility to the Union:—and hostility to the Union is, in the eye of American patriotism, the most odious of all offences—the most heinous of all crimes.

I prize the Union, because I prize the wisdom, courage, philanthropy, and piety, of which it was begotten. I prize it, because I prize the signal sufferings and sacrifices, which it cost our fathers. I prize it, because I prize its objects—those great and glorious objects, that prompted to the Declaration of Independence; that were cherished through a seven years' war; and that were then recited in the preamble of the Constitution, as the objects of the Constitution. I prize it, for the great power it has to honor God and bless man. I prize it, because I believe the day will come, when this power shall be exerted to this end.

Now, surely, opposition to slavery cannot be hostility to such a Union. Such a Union is not assailed, and cannot be endangered, by opposition, however strenuous, to slavery, or to any other form of oppression, or to any other system of iniquity. To attack what is good, is to be hostile to such a Union. To attack what is evil, is to befriend it.

Nevertheless, the position is persisted in, that to attack slavery is to attack the Union. How are we to account for this persistence in this absurd position? It is easily accounted for. The position is not absurd. There are *two* Unions. There is the Union of early times—that, which our fathers formed, and the most authentic record of the formation of which, and of the spirit and objects of which, is to be found in the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution. This is the Union openly based on the doctrine of the equal rights of all men. This is the Union, the avowed purpose of which is "to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty." Then, there is the other Union—the Union of later times—of our times—manufactured, on the one hand, by Southern slaveholders, and, on the other, by Northern merchants and Northern politicians. The professed aims of this new Union are, of course, patriotic and beautiful. Its real, and but thinly disguised, aims are to extend and perpetual slavery on the one hand, and political and commercial gains on the other. The bad character of this new Union is not more apparent in its aims, than in its fruits, which prove these aims. Among these fruits are Union-Safety Committee Resolutions; Baltimore platforms; proslavery pledges of members of Congress, resolutions of servile Legislatures; contemptible Inaugurals, in which, now a Governor, and now a President, go all lengths for slavery; and, above all, or rather below all, Union-saving and slave-catching sermons of devil-deluded and devil-driven Doctors of Divinity. To this list is, now, to be added the stupendous breach of faith proposed in the bill before us. This Bill, which lays open all our unorganized territory to slavery, is a legitimate fruit of the new Union. The consecration of all the national territory to freedom, sixty-five years ago, was the legitimate fruit of the old Union. Which is the better Union? By their fruits ye shall know them.

Now, the matter is not explained by saying, that this new Union is but a misinterpretation of the old. Misinterpretation cannot go so far, as to change the whole nature of its subject. Oh no, it is not a misinterpretation. But it is distinctly and entirely another Union, with which its manufacturers are endeavoring to supplant the Union given to us by our fathers:—and this supplanting Union is as unlike the precious gift, as darkness is unlike light, as falsehood is unlike truth.

When, then, we, who are laboring for the overthrow of slavery, and for the practical acknowledgment of the equal rights of all men, are charged with hostility to the Union, it is, indeed, pretended by those, who make the charge, and for the sake of effect, that we are hostile to the original and true Union. Our hostility, nevertheless, is but to the conjured-up and spurious Union. Our only offence is, that we withstand the base appeals and seductive influences of the day. The only cause, for the abundant reproach, which has befallen us, is that in our honesty and patriotism, we still stand by that good old Union, which is a Union for justice and liberty; and that we bravely oppose ourselves to those artful and wicked men, who would substitute for it a Union for slavery, and place, and gain; and who are even impudent enough to claim, that this trumped-up Union is identical with that good old Union. Yes, wicked, artful, impudent, indeed, must they be, who can claim, that this dirty work of their own dirty hands is that veritable work of our fathers, which is the glory of our fathers.

[illegible] TO DOCTOR CHEEVER.

Peterboro *March* 6th 1863.

Rev. Dr. G. B. Cheever, New York,

My dear Sir,

I have read your review of Bishop Colenso's Criticisms on the Pentateuch.

That men cannot believe in God without believing "in every part of the Scriptures"—"in their perfect and infallible truth and certainty,"—is, as I was aware, a doctrine of most of the churches. Nevertheless I was somewhat surprised to find that this exceedingly harsh doctrine has your sanction.

I readily admit that, in the sense of loving God, men cannot believe in Him unless they also believe in the great moral principles and precepts of the Bible. It is only the good heart that lovingly believes in God. Such a heart, wherever or whenever found—be it in the depths of Africa or antiquity—never fails to respond to those principles and precepts. But there are large portions of this book, belief or unbelief in which is a purely intellectual exercise. Whether a particular battle is or is not in all respects rightly described in it is a question of evidence. Precisely the same kind or degree of evidence may not come before all who are gathering it. And even if there should, nevertheless from the difference between them, constitutional as well as educational, they might not be able to arrive at the same conclusion. Half the jurors believe that the evidence is sufficient to convict the accused, and the other half do not. One man can resist the multiplied proofs that the human race has existed on the earth more than six thousand years, and another is obliged to yield to them. To say that some persons are so prejudiced against the Bible as to be incapable of deciding fairly or according to evidence, is but to open the door for the reply that some persons are so partial to it that they cannot decide impartially on any thing in it. Nevertheless whatever may be the play of prejudice or partiality in solving this question about the battle, it remains true that it must be solved by means of evidence. But the question whether we shall lovingly believe in God finds its solution in the affections of the heart rather than in evidence—overflowing and convincing as is the evidence. Insist, I care not how intolerantly, that all men shall believe in essential and eternal goodness. He is a bad man who does not believe in it. But do not condemn men for believing or disbelieving in that, which with a good heart they may either believe or disbelieve in.

Perhaps you will say that there is not this room, which I claim there is, for an honest difference of judgment. Perhaps you will say that there is no occasion for summoning and sifting witnesses; and that the miracles of the Bible prove beyond all possible question the truth of every part of the Bible. I might admit that whoever had the miracles needed no more proof of what they prove, and had no right to call for more. But we have only the record of the miracles: and this record, it must be borne in mind, can prove nothing until itself is proved. Moreover as we are favored with no miracles for proving the truth of the record, we are obliged to set about proving it in the common method of proving records. I do not forget that the practice is to cite the miracles for the truth of the Bible and the Bible for the truth of the miracles. But this glaring instance of vicious circular reasoning forcibly reminds one of the servant who, in answer to his master's quickly successive inquiries for the harrow and the plough, said that the harrow was with the plough and the plough with the harrow.

It is much insisted on that whoever really believes in one part of the Bible believes in every other part of it. It is true that he, who really believes in the inculcations of justice and mercy in one part of the Bible, must from the nature of things believe in the like inculcations in other parts of it. But surely there is no such natural connexion between all parts of the Bible, as makes belief in some of them necessitate belief in the others. It is not a necessity in the nature of things, that belief in the story of Samson should go along with belief in the Sermon on the Mount. In the justice and love which Jesus taught I am compelled by the nature of things—by my own nature—to believe. But I am under no such compulsion to believe that he was born here rather than there—this year rather than that. To believe in the justice and love I need not go out of myself for evidence: but I must do so in order to believe in the other. The testimony of my heart suffices in the former case. But in the latter I must seek for other and outward testimony. It will be said that if we are not sure of the truth of what the Bible says of the birth of Christ, we cannot be sure that it truly ascribes to him such high and heavenly utterances. I admit we cannot be. Nevertheless of the utterances and their matchless power—and this is the great point—we are sure. And sure too are we that the utterer, whatever his name, whenever or wherever born, spake as "never man spake," and stood upon an immeasurably higher plane of life than man ever stood upon before. I am not entirely certain when or where Shakspeare was born, nor that he wrote the plays ascribed to him. But I am certain of the plays and of their power to stir the soul: and certain am I also that whoever, whenever, wherever he was that wrote them, he was incomparably the greatest of all known dramatists. And now, compared with these certainties, what else is there in all this connexion of any value?

It is often said that we must believe in the possibility of the miracles, because the miracles Jesus wrought are needed to prove his divinity. It is his *words*, that prove his divinity. The power to work miracles can be claimed for any man; and with such evidence, as would convince multitudes. But there has been only one man from whom the divine words attributed to Jesus could have proceeded. The celebrated Brahmin, Rammohun Roy, omitted the miracles from his translation of the New Testament—for the reason that the Jewish miracles being so infinitely surpassed in wondrousness by the Hindoo miracles, would serve rather to disparage than exalt the precious and sublime truths with which they stand connected. Then, again, it is so difficult to prove the truth of ancient miracles to those who deny the truth of modern miracles. How can one, who, requiring evidence for all his beliefs, refuses faith in the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, give his assent to a miracle far back in the depths of antiquity? The miracle in the former case is attested by known and living witnesses—but in the latter by unknown and dead ones. How can he then, provided he be swayed less by superstition than by evidence, utterly reject the former miracle and be entirely sure of the latter one?

I wish with all my heart that you would be content to teach only the one true religion, which you do teach, and to leave it to others to teach the nominal and mistaken religions. This one true or natural religion is the same in all lands and all ages. It is this which made beautiful and sublime the lives of Confucius, Socrates and Plato. It is this which shone pre-eminently, ay culminated, in the life of Jesus. It is of this that your own honest, earnest, strong life comes. It is the religion of human nature; and it is inspired by the Author of all nature. It is as simple as it needs to be in order to be the religion of the simple masses. The unlearned can both understand and practise it. Thousands of the slaves, who are now coming forth from the great American Prison House, prove that they who know nothing else may nevertheless know this religion.

Greatly do they err who suppose that Jesus was the author of a religion. He taught no other than the religion of nature, which great and good men of all the climes and all the centuries had taught before. He but pointed men back to the old religion—to the teaching or religion of their own unchanged and unchangeable nature. This he declared to be their sufficient instructor in their religious duties; and hence does he inquire of them: "Why judge ye not even of yourselves what is right?"

I said that this religion is simple. Paul makes it nothing else than to "love thy neighbor as thyself," and Jesus sums it all up in doing as we would be done by. That to Him who made us capable of this equal love, and who is made to be Loved, to love supreme love, is an irresistible inference.

But although there is only one true religion, there are innumerable conventional religions. It is only a very small proportion of men who have the true religion. A very large proportion have a conventional one. Even those who have the true religion, have with comparatively few exceptions a conventional religion also. Meet with a Hindoo or Persian or Turk, who has the true religion, or in other words a heart to deal justly with his neighbor in all things—and, with scarce an exception to the contrary, you find that he combines with it a conventional religion drawn from his Sacred Books. So too it is but a very small proportion of the religiously just men of Christendom, be they Jews or Gentiles, who to their true or natural religion do not add some one of the false and artificial religions which are claimed to be authorized by Jewish writings. Do not understand me to say that the true religion is not also to be found in the Vedas, the Zendaveste, the Koran and the Bible. Each inculcates it—the Bible with infinitely more clearness, fullness and power than does any of the other Sacred Books. Nevertheless from each of them are materials drawn to build up unnatural and false religions.

I do not forget that they who unite with the true religion a conventional one make the latter an essential part of the former. Very certain is it that they do so, who draw their conventional religion from the Bible. This is manifestly the case with yourself. But these conventional religions contain much that is at war with the natural or true religion—much that is repugnant to the moral sense produced by the latter. Even the conventional religion made up from the Bible is obnoxious to this censure. For instance, it requires us to believe that God loved Jacob and hated Esau, "being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil." Will it be said that He loved the one and hated the other for what they would become? But Jacob became a mean man and Esau a magnanimous one. Again, it requires us to believe that God gave Saul's wives into David's bosom, and laid him under obligations of gratitude for it. And, again, it requires us to believe that there may be upon God's authority, wholesale slaughters of women and children.

Alas, the innumerable and appalling proofs in all ages of the disparaging and neutralizing of the natural or true religion by coupling with it a conventional and false religion! The Rev. Dr. Thomas Worcester of Boston is reputed to be a very good man. Nevertheless he admits that until very recently he believed "Slavery to be a good thing"—in other words, the system which forbids marriage and parental rights and all rights and markets men as beasts, "to be a good thing". Whence did he derive this belief? Evidently not from his natural or true religion but from the conventional and false one which he had unhappily combined with it. All over the Southern half of our country and extensively over the Northern half also Slavery is held to be right, on the ground that the Bible makes it right. I agree with you that the Bible condemns it. But good men differ at this point; and bad men so read it, as to suit themselves. The natural religion—the religion of doing as you would be done by—instantly and utterly forbids slavery. No man would be a slave. And, were there no pro-slavery conventional religion in which their conscience could find shelter, few could brace themselves up to be slaveholders, and none would be allowed to be. Thrice happy for the interests of freedom and humanity that you read the Bible to be against slavery! But, alas, should you in some new light shed upon its meaning come to read it otherwise, then, though all nature cries out trumpet-tongued against the abomination, you would be for it! For with you that Book is above all nature. Or if you prefer it, that Book is with you the supreme and authoritative interpreter of nature.

In my reference to miracles I did not deny their possibility. I agree with you that your conventional religion (I speak not now of your true one,) needs miracles to authenticate it. I add that there is not a little of beautiful fitness in proving the religion which is a war upon nature by miracles which are also a war upon nature. On the other hand you will agree with me that if the true religion is the simple and obvious thing which I have defined it to be, miracles are no more needed to prove it than to prove the Sun in the heavens.

This breaking up of the Churches, which has begun in our day, does, I confess, bring no sorrow to my heart. Her way must be clean swept of them before Truth can "have free course and be glorified." They are the bulwarks of superstition instead of religion. They are huge conventionalisms, which have usurped the place of nature, and the place of the simple, rational churches of Jesus Christ. They are, and none the less effectively because unintentionally, the great enemies of human progress, human holiness and human happiness. I rejoiced to see right feeling for the slave—in one word, religion—break up the Baptist Church and the Methodist Church. For this breaking up not only proves that religion finds hearts in these churches which she can work upon; but it awakens the reasonable hope that large portions of their members will continue to improve and to go onward and upward until they shall at last have eliminated from their creeds all the conventional and artificial, and be prepared to take part in building up the church of the one true religion. And now I rejoice to see that science is beginning to break up the Church of England. It would be an entirely reasonable expectation, that the Baptist and Methodist Churches, characterized as they are by a wider diffusion of piety than of learning, might be torn asunder by a religious question. As reasonably would it be expected that science might make breaches in the Church of England—a Church in which there are so many who appreciate science—a Church which, notwithstanding the much heartfelt and holy worship in it, is nevertheless more distinguished for its learning than for its piety. The only way to have held back Colenso and the Authors of the celebrated "Essays and Reviews" from being disturbing forces in the Church of England was to have held them back from Geology, Astronomy and the other fields of science. And the only way to prevent others from following them and becoming even disrupting forces in that Church is to roll back the wheels of civilization. To secure the Bible from all possible criticism, they will have to be rolled back not only to the comparatively recent date, when belief in God's authority for polygamy and the most savage warfare was well nigh universal; but they will have to be rolled back to those early centuries, when none doubted that the Sun and the Moon were made but to be candles for the Earth.

You ought not to wonder at the modern growth of infidelity. It is infidelity to conventional and superstitious religions—to religions unadapted to modern times. Ages, which believed in Astrology, Alchemy and the healing of wounds and the wildest doctrines and usages of an all-swaying superstition, could of course, and very consistently and easily, resign themselves to such religions. But it is not strange that an age, which puts Astronomy in the place of Astrology, and Chemistry in the place of Alchemy, and enlightened laws in the place of fanatical traditions, and which is coming up rapidly out of the slough of ignorance and superstition toward the summits of science, should be weary of such religions and impatient to throw them off.

You [illegible] the enlightenment and [illegible] of the whole earth. So do I. But it is mainly in very different ways that we seek to accomplish it. You would supplant with the Jewish Sacred Books the Sacred Books of all other peoples. I, on the contrary, would call upon the disciples of Mohamedanism and of all the other religions to learn, love and practice that one religion of reason, nature and Jesus, which is common to all these Books.

How vain the hope that the Turks, the Persians, the Chinese or Hindoos will ever consent to cast upon their most cherished names and writings the contempt, which they would cast upon them, should they acknowledge the Jewish Books to be true and their own to be false! But how reasonable the hope that as all shall come to know, love and practice the one true religion, the interest of all in their respective Sacred Books, save only in those portions of them which partake of and illustrate the essence of that religion, will pass away forever.

The churches must go down before the powers of religion and science. Their walls are not impervious to the heavenly influences of the one, nor have they strength to resist the increasingly mighty assaults of the other. And as surely as these churches shall go down, others will take their places, that will teach and illustrate the religion of reason and nature; and that will know men not by their theological metaphysics and mysteries, but solely as the Great Teacher of the religion of nature and reason requires, "by their fruits." But these churches of a conventional religion will linger for ages. Science is not yet ripe enough, nor diffused enough, to perform its part in overthrowing them. A portion of the scientific men, who concern themselves about religion, had embraced their conventional religion before their minds were stored with science and their habits of exacting legitimate and ample evidence for their beliefs were formed. Such will be like to live and die in the superstition, that their religion is too sacred to be put upon trial. Then a much larger portion of the men of science, though despising this superstition, do, like other men, care for the public favor and the advantages that come of it. Hence they conclude to drift along with the superstition, instead of exercising the courage to expose and overthrow it. Not until science shall be far more spread through the masses, and not until it shall become so sound and uncompromising, as to require all things, and that too even in the department of religion, to be proved, will a large share of the scientific men strike boldly at the absurdities in the religious systems. But they will do so then. For then it will not be unpopular to do so; and therefore not unsafe to their interests. Then they will find willing hearers—a good soil to cast the seeds of scepticism into. Sceptics are much dreaded. Nevertheless the world will never have its race of sound believers until it has first had its race of enlightened and honest sceptics.

In the meantime however, and whilst science is mustering its forces for its final and effectual onset upon these artificial and superstitious religions and their churches, here one man and there another, who can afford the personal loss of striking at hoary and popular errors, and who are willing for conscience and truth's sake to incur hatred and scorn, must continue their protests against identifying religion with things which are no part of religion, and with things which misrepresent, conflict with, and neutralize it.

I hope you will not be offended at what I have written:—and yet I cannot be entirely sure that you will not. For I am aware that one part of the orthodox training is, that nothing in the whole range of orthodoxy is an open question, or liable to a wise and an honest doubt. Hence I was not surprised to find you making light of both the sense and the candor of Bishop Colenso.

It is this perfect confidence that in the whole huge bundle of beliefs, which make up orthodoxy, be it in Christendom or Hindostan or elsewhere, there is not the slightest flaw, nor aught which a man sound in both head and heart can find to criticise—it is this, which renders religious reformation, be it in Christendom or Heathendom, so difficult and so distant.

The political economist allows me to confront him. Often has a slaveholder heard my Anti-Slavery patiently and kindly. Often so has a rumseller heard my Temperance. But when I speak on religion, many of my neighbors, and those of them too who for thirty or forty years have heard me quite willingly on all other subjects, refuse to hear me. They are too civil and too kind to say either that I am foolish or dishonest: and yet, when religion is my theme, they can hardly help feeling that I am one or the other, if not indeed both—so almost impossible is it for them to conceive that a man can have both sense and candor, or even either, who ventures a doubt on anything in orthodox theology.

Theology! Theology!! Oh, how the poor world has in all ages been cursed by it! But gradually, though slowly, one thing after another escapes from its thraldom to theology. Now it is Geology; and now it is Astronomy; and by and by, in the progress of science and civilization, religion itself will escape from it.

With great regard,

your friend

GERRIT SMITH.

TELL THEM SUFFRAGE EVEN TO SOLDIERS!

ANOTHER PROOF THAT THE NATION IS RUINED!

10

Tell the drunkard or the debauchee that he is a ruined man, and he will stare upon you with astonishment and frown upon you with indignation. So is it with this nation. She is annoyed and angry at the charge of being ruined. Nevertheless she has been ruined for more than forty years. From the sad hour, when Slavery triumphed over Freedom in the Missouri Compromise, down to the present no sadder hour she has never ceased to be a ruined nation.

Our nation saw a fierce and mighty Rebellion spring up within her borders and ripen into the organization of an independent government. She saw here and there her little Peace army, or rather armed police, betrayed into its hands; and here and there the rebels plundering her treasuries. She saw them so bold as to fire at her ships, and seize her forts, and build up fortifications over against her own. Nevertheless (—thing unheard of in the history of nations!—) she did not move. Why did she not? Simply because she could not. Why could she not? Simply because she was ruined.

It is true that the news of the taking of Sumter proved that the nation was not entirely dead. This electric shock detected some lingering remains of patriotism. But that President Lincoln, though loyal and loving the right, was nevertheless incompetent to avail himself of the occasion and to strike effectively for her salvation, was among the painful proofs that the nation was still ruined. In common with the nation he was drugged and debauched by Slavery. How then could he suddenly rise up in earnest resistance to the Rebellion it had prompted? Oh could he have then believed that the military necessities of the country would justify his summoning to his standard every slave in the land, how soon would the Rebellion have been put down! Or even had he gone no farther than to summon to it, at that clock of time, the slaves of the revolted States. Are we told that the people were not yet prepared for so strong a measure? They were:—and never since so well. Moreover, the measure itself would have completed the preparation—would have supplied any possible lack in it. Nothing is so mighty to convert men to the right as bravery for the right. The fearless and unhesitating leader is the one they love to follow. Had the tide in our nation's affairs been taken at the Sumter flood it would have led her "on to fortune." But our leader lacked the courage and decision to take it. Through his timidity and indecision it was left to subside, with but little profit having come of it. And alas, how has her voyage since been "bound in shallows and in miseries!" The enthusiasm kindled by the outrageous and infamous assault on Sumter was suffered to pass away. Very soon the people sank down into a willingness to hear demagogues and traitors prate about the Constitution. In none but a ruined nation can the people, at the very time when the life of their nation is struck at, give ear to such prating.

Does this late-in-the-day call upon the blacks to enrol themselves in our Army prove that our nation is not ruined? Far from it—especially so, since the Government has not the manliness to promise to see to it that captured blacks shall, instead of being murdered or sold into slavery as the rebels threaten, be treated as prisoners of war.

I referred to this prating about the Constitution. It continues unabated to this day. Anxiety lest we may lose, not the Country, but the Constitution, is no less irrational and is infinitely more ruinous than would be anxiety to save, not the man from drowning, but his hat from going down stream.

I, who have never spoken nor written one word against the Constitution, and who have spoken and written more words for it than did ever any Pro-Slavery man living or dead, can afford to say that this prating for it has made "Constitution" the most offensive of all the sounds that strike upon my ear. "Slavery" itself is to me a less disturbing word than this one under cover of which Slavery is hypocritically served.

I spoke of the continuance of this prating. To reply to every proposition for a more vigorous prosecution of the War, we are still met with the cry: "The Constitution! The Constitution!" And even now, when we would help on the War by allowing the soldiers of the State of New York to vote at her Elections, we are met by this same cry. Surely, surely, we have here another proof that our nation is ruined.

How commanding are the reasons for allowing them to vote! No other class of men have so emphatic a right to vote for the rulers of their country as these, who are perilling their lives for her and doing more than any and all other classes to save her. There is no other class of men whose rights we should hold so sacred. Then to convince them that we love them, and stand by them, we should hasten to recognize all their rights and to facilitate their exercise. Moreover, that they may be inspired to do their utmost for their country they must see that they are regarded, not as her armed defenders only, but as still her citizens—and her citizens not robbed of, but protected in, their rights by their fellow citizens whom they have left at home. A European Army is for the most part made up of the dregs of the population—of men without acknowledged political rights and without character. Very different is our Army. It is composed of those, who, besides being our superiors in patriotism and courage, are our equals in rights, intelligence and character. Let this be borne in mind by all who would disfranchise them. I add that there is no other class of men, whom we should feel ourselves so strongly bound to honor and to gratify in every possible way as our noble and beloved soldiers. Another argument for allowing the soldiers to vote is, that here one of them who is a Democrat and there one of them who is a Republican will, under some excuse or other, go home to play his part in deciding a hotly contested and doubtful Election. This, besides damaging the efficiency of the Army, furnishes just ground of complaint, now to one of the Parties and now to the other. Nevertheless the temptation to this violation of duty is too strong to be successfully resisted by all. American citizens, educated, as they are, to prize the ballot, and accustomed, as they are, to cast it, cannot easily school themselves into contentment with not casting it.

But it is claimed that the framers of the Constitution of our State intended that voting at our Elections should be always in person and never by proxy. Our Pro-Slavery demagogues have made so much account of the Pro-Slavery words of some of the framers of the Federal Constitution, that the habit of interpreting a Constitution in the light of what its framers intended has come to obtain all over the country. But in point of fact the intentions of its framers as such are not to be allowed to enter at all into the interpretation and meaning of a Constitution—no, no more than the intentions of the scrivener, who wrote the deed, into the interpretation and meaning of the deed. What the people who adopted it intended by it is the only legitimate inquiry at this point: and what they intended by it is to be learned solely from its letter, where that is unambiguous. Nay more—where the purpose is to defeat rights (and suffrage is among the highest rights,) we are not at liberty to seek help outside of the letter of the Constitution.

The letter of the Constitution in the case before us is entirely free from ambiguity. It clearly leaves it to the Legislature to say how the voting shall be—whether in person or by proxy—whether it shall be all in one way—or a part in one way, and a part in another. It does say that a part of the voting shall be by ballot: and it might as easily have said that all voting shall be in person. But it does not say it. What it would have said, had it spoken on the point, is an utterly impertinent inquiry. Moreover it is a fair, not to say irresistible inference that inasmuch as the Constitution does at one point and only one point prescribe the manner of voting, it intended to leave it to the Legislature to prescribe it at every other. I add that were it our custom to vote by proxy no one would regard such voting as repugnant to the Constitution. But clearly if with that custom it would not be unconstitutional, the lacking of that custom cannot make it unconstitutional. Not custom, but the Constitution, determines what voting is Constitutional.

So far as the Constitution is concerned the Legislature may provide that all the voting be by proxy. I admit that such a provision would be unwise. I admit too that I can conceive of no other case than that of the soldiers in which it would be wise. In their case it would be, not only for the reasons I have mentioned, but because the soldiers are so numerous. I would not, for the sake of accommodating a comparatively handful of aged or infirm men, have our States allow so objectionable a mode of voting as is that by proxy. But for the sake of securing the rights of half a million to a million of soldiers I would not only have them allow it, but I would denounce the denial of it as unreasonable and unrighteous—a high crime against both the soldiers and the country.

For one I shout with joy, and I would have every other lover of his dear country and of her dear defenders do so, that there is not one line nor one word in our State Constitution against voting by proxy.

I said that our nation is ruined. She is. But I have never despaired of her recovery from her ruin. Few things inspire me with so strong a hope of this recovery as the growing disposition to let the Army vote. They who meet the rebels face to face, know better how to vote than do we who keep ourselves at a safe distance from the foe. Ay, and they have better earned the right to vote. If either of us must be disfranchised—I, who remain amidst the comforts and safety of home, or he who welcomes the sufferings and perils of the soldier; I, who know the rebels but by hearing of them, or he, who knows them by seeing and feeling them; I, who but read of the battles, or he, who has part in them—then, in the name of reason and religion, let it be I and not he.

PETERBORO *April 20th* 1863.

GERRIT SMITH.

PETERBORO, May 20th 1863.

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER,

MY DEAR SIR,

I have read in the Independent your column on the late "Stonewall" Jackson. I honor him for his earnestness, sincerity and dereutness. I grant that he was a deeply religious man. But I cannot agree with you that his religion was of the Christ-type. How can it be in the light of your own admission, that he was "the champion of slavery"—the champion of that system, which denies all right to husband, wife, child; all right to resist the ravisher or murderer; and which works and whips and markets men as beasts? How can it be in the light of your admission, that "he was fighting against the natural rights of man"? Nevertheless you declare him to be "a rare and eminent christian." I readily admit that even these enormous crimes against justice and humanity are compatible with high religious graces. But I cannot admit that he who is guilty of them is grounded in the Christ-religion and is "eminent" in its graces. For the Christ-religion is simply a religion of justice. It does as it would be done by. It is for, and not "against the natural rights of man." For it is simply the religion of nature.

I do not wonder that the Churches regard Jackson's as the Christ-religion. For the bundle of dogmas, Trinity, Atonement, Resurrection of the Body, Miracles, &c., which they make up and hold to be essential to salvation, he deeply believed in. I say not whether these dogmas are true or false—originating in fancies or in facts. I but say that they are no part of the Christ-religion. Natural justice toward God and man—so earnest and entire as to fill the heart and life with its presence and power—this and this alone is the essence and the all of that religion. Think not that I look for such justice where the Divine Spirit is not at work to produce it. In order to attain to it depraved man—man who has run away from his nature—must be "born again."

Jackson had the theology of a Church. But he certainly had not a large share of the religion of Christ. Christ was opposed to all the theologies—for he saw that they all stand in the way of the one true religion—the religion of reason and nature. A theological or common Church religion is a traditional religion, authenticated by miracles and other outward testimonies. At the best it is but a history—and full of all the characteristic uncertainty of history. Moreover if parts of the history or of its accepted interpretation shall prove false, then, as is held, the deceived disciple is lost. Such is the untrustworthy plank on which men are urged to embark their all. But Christ's religion is no historic nor external thing. It cometh not from the past, and it "cometh not with observation." It "is within" us. It is written by the finger of God in the moral consciousness: and every one, who will listen to God's voice in his soul, will know this religion, or, in other words, will know what is right. "And why," says Jesus, "even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" Instead of sending his hearers to Moses he sends them to themselves. Instead of bidding them go to priests to get religion interpreted, he tells them to interpret it for themselves. Instead of making religious truths a mystery, which only the wise and learned can unravel, he thanks his Father for having "revealed them unto babes." Instead of teaching a religion as fluctuating and uncertain as human testimony is fluctuating and uncertain, he teaches a religion founded and fashioned in human nature, and therefore as unchangeable as human nature—a religion the same in all climes and ages, because human nature is the same in all climes and ages. Instead of teaching a cabalistic and conventional religion whose rules are hard and impossible to be understood, he teaches the natural and reasonable religion which has but one rule—and this rule so obvious and simple that all know it and need nothing but honesty to apply it. All know how they would be done by: and hence all know what to do to others.

I am amazed that you make so much account of Jackson's theological bundle and of his being "an active member of the Presbyterian Church of which he was a ruling Elder". These in your esteem suffice to carry him straight to Heaven. I had supposed that your strong common sense and large intelligence had long ago lifted you up out of the superstitious faith that any such things can carry any man to Heaven. I had taken it for granted that you believed that it is his character however induced —whether by himself or by Christ or otherwise—that alone qualifies a man for Heaven;—so obvious is it in the light of reason that every man must go to his own place, and that what shall be his place must be determined not by his theology but by his character. But I was mistaken. For in the same breath in which you send Jackson to Heaven you argue not for him a thoroughly base and abominable character—even, to use your strong and eloquent words, a "comprehensive and fundamental degradation of heart and mind and soul."

So, since it cannot be in virtue of his character, it must be in virtue of his theology and ecclesiasticism, that you send Jackson to Heaven. Or, am I again mistaken? Perhaps you believe that the death of the body works a moral changes; and that though Jackson died with a bad character he woke up with a good one.

But notwithstanding I believe that our character in this life is that still which we begin the next, I have hope for "Stonewall" Jackson. And this hope for two reasons. First, I do not believe his character to be as bad as you make it. In many an instance slaveholding does not deprave and debase the whole soul. Unconsciousness of its criminality and a kindly exercise of its despotic power are among the things which leave room for the growth of self-respect and other high virtues. Second, the Christ-religion will be more clearly seen and more justly judged in the next life: and mistaken and guilty though still largely noble souls, like the "Stonewall" Jackson's, will hasten to exchange their miserable theologies for it. Nay, I trust, that our Church-misled here already begins to see more beauty and preciousness in the simple doctrine of doing as we would be done by than in all the dogmas and prayers and rites of his corrupt and corrupting Church.

But I must stop. I meant to write only a few lines. How long, oh how long, my great-souled brother, must we still wait for the open enlistment of your large powers against the theologies? I confess that you preach the religion of Jesus, and that you preach it with rare force and beauty. But alas, how is this preaching counteracted by your preaching the theologies also! The cause of truth cannot afford to have Henry Ward Beecher continue to mix up traditional trash and even traditional sweetnesses or sublimities with that religion. She needs him to be wholly and not but partly on her side.

With great regard

your friend

GERRIT SMITH.

SMITHFIELD'S BOUNTY

12

TO

SMITHFIELD'S VOLUNTEERS.

Our Town has done well; and will doubtless continue to do well. She has given many thousands of dollars to provide comforts for soldiers and their families, and clothing and instruction for the freedmen. Although her population is less than fifteen hundred, she furnished a large share of the Peterboro Infantry Company of 1861 and a majority of the Pete[illegible] Infantry Company of 1862. A few weeks ago a dozen of her citizens, instead of buying themselves off under the Commutation Clause in the Draft Law, went to the War either in person or by substitutes. A number more have, at different times, gone to Syracuse or Utica or elsewhere to enlist. And now, when the Government is again calling for volunteers, she proposes, if the Government consents, and she can be thereby saved from the Draft, to organize a Company of Cavalry.

Does any one ask—whence comes the earnestness, which bears all these fruits? We answer that it comes from the conviction, that this Rebellion is the greatest crime ever committed against a Nation—or rather against the Nations. For it is a crime not against one nation only, but against all nations—against all mankind. From the contagion and results of such a crime, if it be allowed to succeed, no nation however remote and no people however isolated can be secure.

Thus viewing the Rebellion our Town went unconditionally into the work of putting it down. She held that, come what might from it to Democracy or Republicanism, to Slavery or Anti-Slavery, to any interest or object private or public, this infernal Rebellion must be put down.

Our Town would betray a disgraceful lack of patriotism should she fail to furnish enough volunteers to save her from the threatened Draft—if indeed she can in this wise be saved from it. Moreover, since to many families it would bring great distress, she is urged by compassion as well as by patriotism to save herself from it.

There are many persons in this Town, who would like to show their affectionate and grateful interest in her forthcoming volunteers by joining in a Bounty to each of them (up to the required number, which is supposed to be 20 to 25,) of four hundred dollars, to be paid one month after he shall have been mustered into the service of the United States. Let all contributions to this Bounty be paid at my Office by the fifteenth day of next January.

I add my promise that this Bounty of four hundred dollars shall be paid. This promise is nevertheless made upon the following conditions:

First, that the volunteering shall save our Town from the Draft. [It is reported that the volunteering and drafting are to be, this time, by Congressional Districts instead of Towns: and that this change, so full of disappointment and distress, is simply to save labor to the officials. Small indeed would be this saving of a day or two's labor, when weighed against the happy effect of the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars by the liberal men of a Congressional District to the end of promoting so extensive a volunteering in their respective Towns as would save those Towns from the Draft. I cannot believe that the Government will consent to so great a public sacrifice for the sake of lightening the labors of a few of her well paid servants. If we are not allowed to work by Towns, then almost necessarily, unless the Legislature shall, by means of a very large Bounty prevent it, the Draft must take place in all our rural Congressional Districts.]

Second, should the present Government Bounties, including any that there may *now* be of this State, exceed the total sum of three hundred and two dollars, the excess shall be deducted from the aforesaid Town Bounty of four hundred dollars.

Third, should there before the expiration of the aforesaid one month, be a further Government Bounty granted, be it by the Nation or by our State or by both, the said further Bounty or Bounties shall be deducted from the aforesaid Town Bounty of four hundred dollars.

Fourth, should the wages of the soldiers be increased before the expiration of the aforesaid month, and be increased as much as fifty dollars a year, then and in that case the sum of fifty dollars shall be deducted from the aforesaid Town Bounty of four hundred dollars.

GERRIT SMITH.

PETERBORO, *November 30th* 1863.

SPEECH OF GERRIT SMITH

IN MONTREAL, DEC. 19, 1863.

I chose this time for visiting Montreal because I saw in the newspapers that a case involving the reputation of one of my old and dear friends (Hon. J. R. Giddings) was to be tried in your Courts at this time. Being in your city, I was not only willing but glad to consent to make a speech on the state of my country.

I love Canada. My own mother was born on the banks of your Sorel. It has ever been my desire that my country and yours should be peaceable and pleasant neighbors. I was a member of the American Congress when nine years ago it sanctioned the Reciprocity Treaty between us. Other members may have worked for that sanction more influentially and efficiently, but none worked harder for it, than I did. It is extensively believed in my country that the Treaty is more advantageous to you than to us: and I notice a present movement in Congress for discontinuing it. I hope that it and every other movement to this end may fail. I love the Treaty. I love it, because it tends to promote friendly intercourse and to multiply ties between us. This is, in my judgment, far more important than to make money out of it. I am myself in favor of an absolutely free trade. I would not have a Custom-House on the earth. I believe that the Great and Good Father of us all would have his children left free to buy and sell in all the markets. I would of course have the exchanges between nations include merchandize and manufactures. But if there are nations that refuse to include them, I nevertheless would not have my nation refuse to exchange natural productions with such nations.

My country is sorely afflicted. A Rebellion the most gigantic and also the most guilty the world ever saw has broken out against her. Nevertheless all Canadians do not sympathize with her. I do not infer this from the fact that persons within her borders have recently sought to make Canada a base of military operations against us. These persons, I doubt not, were nearly all refugees from my own country. I am sure the Canadians did not countenance the crime. Nor did their Government. Nay, I am informed that it was some one in their Government (thanks to that some one!) who informed Lord Lyons of the plot. Thanks to Lord Lyons also, who, as the story runs, left his bed at midnight to inform my Government of it! No, it is not from this that I infer the lack of Canadian sympathy. It is from other things, and especially from the spirit of many of the Canadian newspapers. There are Canadian newspapers, and some of them are in this city, that speak rightly of our Rebellion. I read the Toronto Globe: and I would that all your newspapers spoke of the Rebellion in the spirit in which that able and excellent newspaper speaks of it.

I said that I love Canada. I add that I love Great Britain also. Toward her as well as toward Canada I stand in filial relations. For my mother's mother was born in green Ireland: and if having a Livingston for a grandfather makes a Scotchman then am I a Scotchman also. But more than this, all men of my advanced age, whose childhood's language was the English, are more or less educated by Great Britain. Our manners, habits, characters come in no small degree from the moulding influences of her statesmen, historians, poets and novelists.

I referred to the lack in Canada of sympathy with my distressed country. There is the like lack in Great Britain also. I do not infer it from her acknowledgment of belligerent rights in the rebels. I justify that acknowledgment: and my country should feel herself estopped from complaining of it by the fact that she found herself obliged to accord these rights to the rebels. The simple truth is that the rebels were too numerous to be treated as pirates and outlaws. Just here however let me say that burning captured ships at sea is not among belligerent rights. If the rebels have no ports into which to take the captured vessel for adjudication, then so far they have no belligerent rights. Nor do I infer this lack of British sympathy from the fact that British-built vessels have gone out from British ports to be used by the Rebels in preying upon the commerce of my country. I am sure that the people of Great Britain do not approve this: and the British Government is giving honorable and satisfactory testimony that it also does not approve it. Moreover, not only the British conscience but the British interest is against it. For Great Britain to justify or to suffer this indirect war upon us would be to leave herself without cause of complaint when in turn we should treat her so. That we should be provoked to such retaliation is well nigh certain. Nor do I argue this lack of sympathy in Great Britain from her treatment of us in the Trent affair—wrong as I think it to have been. A word about that treatment. I will, if you say so, admit that international law was on her side in that affair. I will, if you say so, admit that there was no impropriety, no indecency, no affectation in the firing up of her indignation at that in our one vessel the like of which we had suffered from many scores of her vessels. And I will too, if you say so, admit that her Government had the right to make no account of the certain knowledge it had seasonably come into possession of, that our Government had not indorsed the acts of Captain Wilkes. Nevertheless after making all these admissions, I must still hold that in the Trent affair your country did mine a great and a grievous wrong. For without giving a moment's time for negotiation she virtually declared war: loading her cannon and lighting the match, and giving us but time to fall down upon our knees and beg her pardon. And all this too when we had upon our hands a most fearful civil war. And all this too when she knew that Capt. Wilkes did not only not intend any wrong to British interests, but did intend to preserve them all most carefully. And all this too when she knew that Capt. Wilkes' not taking the Trent into port for adjudication was because of his deep desire to save her and the interests embarked in her from inconvenience and loss. But you will say that Capt. Wilkes insulted the British flag. To this I answer that there is not the slightest evidence that he intended to. Nevertheless he did will be your rejoinder. I know what is the British spirit—the British jealousy—in regard to the British flag, and especially when it floats over a ship—for Britain is even more of a water than land-fowl. I will not say aught in derogation or complaint of this spirit. But this much I will say—that on the same wise and christian principle that an individual should not return an insult with a blow, a nation should not. England regards herself, and I will not say unjustly, as the foremost nation in christian civilization. But how sad that a nation thus advanced should be ready to go to war for a point of honor! Perhaps you will say that my own nation would do so. I fear she would. This however would only show that my nation like yours has not yet risen into obedience to all the laws of Christ.

No, it is not from the things I have mentioned that I argue Britain's lack of sympathy with my greatly afflicted country. I argue it from the tone of a large share of the British press; from a class of speeches made in many British Meetings and the responses to them; and from the reports of many Americans, who, in their visits to England, frequently encounter in both high places and low expressions of very ill feeling toward my country.

I proceed to ask why it is that so many Britons on both sides of the Atlantic sympathize with the Rebels.

1st. Is it because of a jealousy of our vast and mighty Republic? *It is*, said one of your intelligent citizens to me, as I sat in the Car by his side, the morning I entered your city: and this gentleman justified the jealousy. But I hope he was wrong in ascribing this British sympathy to so unworthy a cause. We certainly ought to accord to every people their choice of government. I am not myself for the "Monroe Doctrine" to the extent that most of my countrymen are. If Mexico prefers a monarchical government, I would let her have it. And I say this, notwithstanding my life-long advocacy of the most ultra democratic theories of government. I would leave Europe free to persuade all republican America to adopt monarchy. On the other hand America should be left free to attempt the conversion of monarchical Europe. But in neither case compulsion.

2d. Does this British sympathy for the Rebels spring from faith in the doctrine of "Secession"? This doctrine grows out of the claim that the States, which compose the United States, are nations—are sovereignties—notwithstanding they have not sovereign power enough to coin a sixpence. How strange if they are indeed nations and sovereignties, that England has never found it out before! She, in common with all Europe, has gone on maintaining diplomatic relations with our one nation at Washington, instead of with a score or two of nations at Boston, New York, Baltimore, New Orleans &c. Then if these States are all nations and sovereignties, our Constitution must surely show so important a fact. But it shows that the people of the United States (and by the way not the *States* of the United States) made, not a plurality of Constitutions for a plurality of nations, but one Constitution for one nation. And how absurd is the doctrine that our one nation is the agent of a score or two of nations! An agent is held to be inferior to his principals, inasmuch as they appoint and commission him. But in this case the agent, if agent he be, is immensely superior to his principals:—for instead of their watching him and having power over him, he watches them and has power over them. For instance, he is to see to it that they maintain a republican form of government. And so too, instead of his being governed by their laws, they are governed by his—and that too even when his are right in the face of theirs. And what is still more degrading to these claimed-to-be Principals, they are required to swear allegiance to him instead of his being required to swear allegiance to them. How humiliating it must have been to his brethren's sheaves if they had actually to do obeisance to the boy Joseph's sheaf! And how humiliating it must have been to the Sun and Moon and eleven stars if they too had actually to make obeisance to him! But scarcely less humiliating to the numerous States in the United States is their submission to the one reputed nation of the United States, if they are all nations, and this one reputed nation is not a nation; or if, in other words, they are the principals and this but their agent. The doctrine of the right of our States to secede is simply ridiculous. That the people, in adopting the Constitution, voted by States was a convenience, which could not well be dispensed with. But it was a *necessity* also, inasmuch as in this wise only could the assent of the people of each State to that loss of State rights and State sovereignty, which the Constitution called for, be obtained.

3d. Was it because the Southern States were oppressed by a High Tariff, that Britons sympathized with them? But the Morrill or High Tariff was not enacted until the March after the December in which the States began to secede. And, by the way, one justification for enacting it was that our Government would need its avails in reducing those States. We never had a Tariff so welcome to the Southern States as that we had when the Rebellion began. None of our previous Tariffs made so great approaches to the policy of Free Trade. But no Tariff, high or low, is an excuse for War.

4th. Was this British sympathy with the Rebels caused by the growing disposition in my country, as indicated by the triumph of Freedom in Kansas, to keep Slavery out of the Territories? But there is nothing in the Constitution to forbid the growth of such a disposition: and I would hope that there is nothing in your hearts to forbid it.

5th. Was the election of Mr. Lincoln the cause of this sympathy? I confess that it was no small trial of Southern patience to have a man elected to the Presidency, who was opposed to letting Slavery go into the Territories. But the Constitution, which allowed the election of his Pro-Slavery predecessors, equally allowed his election. The North did not rebel because of the former: and the South should not have rebelled because of the latter. Submission to the will of the majority lies at the very foundation of the Government chosen and constructed by the American fathers.

6th. Was this sympathy because of the Northern talk and Northern legislation against Slavery? But free speech is expressly provided for in our Constitution: and hence the South had no more right to rebel when we denounced her system of slave-labor than we had when she was stigmatizing our noble farmers and mechanics as "mudsills" and "greasy fists." As to the legislation against Slavery the North was always ready to have the Supreme Court of the United States pass upon its Constitutionality. There was legislation at the South in favor of Slavery, which the North believed to be unconstitutional. She began to send down Commissioners to the South to invite her to unite with them in measures for bringing such legislation under the review of that Court. But these Commissioners were threatened with murder and forcibly expelled.

7th. Finally, do Britons sympathize with the Rebellion because the Rebels saw that Slavery was unsafe in the old nation and under the old Constitution: that in order to maintain, extend and perpetuate it, they must have a new nation with Slavery for its boasted corner stone—a new nation whose Constitution would recognize property in man as fully and absolutely as it exists in brutes? Such a Constitution they already have; and such a nation they are trying to have. And here let me say, that to have such a Constitution and such a nation was their sole object in rebelling. As to the election of Lincoln they were mere glad of it than sorry for it, since it furnished them, for use amongst the ignorant and undesigning, with a pretext for the Rebellion. The Northern Anti-Slavery legislation was also on the whole welcome to them, since it too helped furnish them with this pretext. As to the Northern talk against Slavery they of course knew that they could not get away from it by getting out of the nation. I need not add that the Tariff was not amongst their grievances—for it was already low, and had they remained in the nation they could have made it lower. I ask again, do Britons sympathize with the Rebellion because it originated in the motive of serving and advancing Slavery? But Britons are opposed to Slavery:—and how therefore can they regard with favor an undertaking to "lengthen the cords and strengthen

the "right" of Slavery?—an undertaking, never before known—that is, to create a nation solely for the slaveholder?

I have done with asking why Britons sympathize with the Rebellion. I hear of no worthy reason for it. There can be none. I will now pass on to mention two grounds on which your sympathy with my country is claimed, and on neither of which you are bound to sympathize with it.

1st. There are writers and orators at the North, who ask the world to favor the cause of the North on the ground that she is prosecuting the war for the overthrow of Slavery. But she is not prosecuting it for that purpose. It is true that Slavery has been much damaged by the war:—only incidentally however. It is true that Slavery will lose its life in this war. The first gun discharged at Sumter shot death into Slavery. From that moment it has never been possible to save it. On the other hand it is also true that the Government, in carrying on the war, has aimed neither to uphold nor overthrow Slavery. It has aimed simply to suppress the Rebellion and preserve the nation. This has been its only object: and whenever it has touched Slavery it has been but to subserve and secure this object.

I further admit that, whilst there are many persons (shame to them!) who would have the Government pervert the war into a war for upholding Slavery, there are on the other hand a few persons, chiefly Abolitionists of misguided zeal, who would have the Rebellion put down only on the condition that Slavery be put down with it. Some of them claim that they herein conform to God's policy. But I must believe that they misinterpret God. My own philosophy teaches, that God would have us put down every sin (and where is there a greater sin than this Rebellion?) unconditionally, uncalculatingly, uncompromisingly. My own philosophy teaches, that we are never to wait, not even an hour nor a moment, to put down a sin, in the hope that by waiting we shall be able to drag down some other sin with it. The sins of earth will go down quickest if we try to put down each as soon as we can.

2d. Your sympathy with the cause of my country is also claimed by Northern orators and writers on the ground that whilst the Southern people are Pro-Slavery the Northern are quite extensively Abolitionists. But you should not sympathize with us on this ground, for it is a false one. It is true that the North is immeasurably less Pro-Slavery than the South: and that in the progress and through the teachings of this war, it is constantly becoming less and less Pro-Slavery. But it is also true that no large proportion of the people of the North are as yet Abolitionists. Our evil inheritance of Slavery from England, whilst corrupting to the very core the people of the South, corrupted very deeply the people of the North also. At the North as well as at the South "Abolitionist" is still the most reproachful, odious and shunned of all names. Not only do the people of the South, but very generally the people of the North also, refuse to sit at table or in the House of Worship by the side of the black man. As an outcast Pariah, as an unclean leper, is the black man as well at the North as at the South. Very extensively at the North is the Bible still held to be for Slavery. Bishop Hopkins of your neighboring Vermont so holds: and simply because he so holds, the Pro-Slavery party tried a few days ago to make him one of the chaplains of Congress. The wickedness of running to the blessed Bible for sanction of the highest possible crime is still very common at the North. The folly of trying to prove by a book that Slavery is right—a folly no less than would be that of trying to prove by it that two and two make five, or that a circle is a square—is still one of the follies of the North. By the way, what could any book, however sacred, be worth, which teaches *that* to be right in which there is not one element of right—nay, not one element but what is utterly and infernally wrong? And the practice still obtains at the North of according the Pro-Slavery construction to the Constitution—to a Constitution which, whilst it contains not one line nor one word for Slavery, expressly declares that: "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Yes, the people of the North do still very generally accept the Pro-Slavery interpretation of the Constitution. And they go so far as to reckon themselves very meritorious and magnanimous for it. Quite recently in the presence of a vast English audience, and by a countryman of mine whose genial spirit, unsurpassed genius and wondrous eloquence on an unlimited variety of topics are admitted and admired wherever he is known, no little credit was claimed for our Northern acquiescence in the Pro-Slavery interpretation. Alas, for the morals and religion, which adjust themselves to such an interpretation, and are made to harmonize with the diabolical wickedness it calls for! I add in this connection, that so far from there being a law for Slavery in the Constitution, there can be no law for it either in or out of the Constitution. Law is for the protection of rights. But Slavery strikes down every right. All would be quick to scout the idea of a law for murder. But Slavery being worse than murder they should be quicker to scout the possibility of a law for Slavery. I say *worse* than murder. For what enlightened parent would not rather see his child in the grave of the murdered than in bondage to the Slaveholder? It is too late for a civilized nation to admit the possibility of the legalization of Slavery. It should be held that the nation, which any longer admits it, does thereby put itself outside the pale of civilization. But surely I did not need to speak to a British audience of the impossibility of legalizing Slavery. How truthfully, eloquently and grandly your own Brougham said: "Tell me not of rights. Talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the rights. I acknowledge not the property. The principles, the feelings of our common nature rise in rebellion against it. Be the appeal made to the understanding or to the heart, the sentence is the same that rejects it. In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim. There is a law above all the enactments of human codes. It is the law written by the finger of God upon the heart of man: and by that law, unchangeable and eternal while men despise fraud and loathe rapine and abhor blood they shall reject with indignation THE WILD AND GUILTY FANTASY THAT MAN CAN HOLD PROPERTY IN MAN."

I have now asked on what grounds it is that Britons sympathize with the greatest and guiltiest Rebellion the world ever knew:—a Rebellion the sole grievance for which was that there was not scope enough for Slavery. And I have now disclaimed two grounds for your sympathy with my country in her resistance to this Rebellion. The way then is opened for me to state the only ground on which I claim the world's sympathy with my country in this resistance. This only ground is THE SACREDNESS OF NATIONALITY. An eminent British statesman has, within the last year, declared that "the South is fighting for independence and the North for empire". The North was offended at the declaration. But it should not have been. Your statesman is right. For one I readily accepted his statement. The South *is* fighting for independence—an independence however which she has no right to. The North *is* fighting for empire: and it is not only a lawful empire but one which she is under the

*NOTE.—Alexander H. Stephens, the Vice President of the Confederacy, and an eminently intellectual man, is good authority for saying 1st, that the North gave the South no cause to rebel, 2d, that to serve and advance the interests of Slavery was the object of rebelling. In his speech of November 14 1860 in the Hall of the House of Representatives of Georgia, Mr. Stephens, who as yet opposed the Rebellion, said: "What right has the North assailed? What interest of the South has been invaded? What justice has been denied, or what claim founded in justice and right has been withheld? Can any of you to-day name one governmental act of wrong deliberately and purposely done by the government at Washington of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge the answer". Then in the month of March 1861, and when, notwithstanding his earnest attempts to lay the storm, he found himself swept away by it, and made the second officer in the new nation, he declared in his speech in Savannah that "the new Constitution had put at rest forever all the agitating questions relating to" Slavery; and that "our new Government is founded upon exactly the opposite ideas" of the old Government and "upon the great truth that Slavery is his (the negro's) natural and moral condition."

highest obligations to fight for. In a twofold sense is it *empire* for which the fight [illegible] the restoration of all the national boundaries and on the restoration of the government commensurate with these boundaries. I repeat it, the only ground on which I claim the world's sympathy with my suffering country is the sacredness of nationality. The family relation is sacred, and must not be violated. A family may of its own accord break up and scatter. But this must not be forced upon it. Nationality is also inviolable. Nations may agree with each other to change their boundaries. But the change must not be forced upon them. All families must leave each family to live: and all nations must leave each nation to live. The family and the nation—or, as I might say, the literal and the national family—are the two institutions of earth whose permanence all families in the one case and all nations in the other should foster and rejoice in. These institutions are too precious to be violated or neglected. Far too large a share of human happiness and human hopes is indissolubly connected with them to allow such violation or neglect. For ninety years the Poles have been without a nation. What arithmetic can compute their sufferings during these ninety years! As I was gazing, the other day, upon the picture of the beautiful and sublime face of an eminent Polish exile, I fancied that the sorrows of a whole nation were expressed in that one face of utter sadness. How murderous was the cruelty, which robbed the Poles of nationality! How far worse than every other form of orphanage was that to which it reduced them! And they still suffer as in the freshness of their suffering. Italy too still bleeds under her dismemberment. And would you, or any of you, in order to gratify a handful of slaveholders, who are compelling their poor ignorant and know-not-what-they-do neighbors to fight for Slavery—and would you, I say, for this miserable and guilty purpose, have the hearts of my countrymen also wrung with the agonies of a broken-up nation,—of a nation, whose physical features show that her North and her South, whatever you may say of her East and West, can never be parted from each other but by a war upon nature as well as upon nationality? Oh when will nations cease from the meanness and wickedness of wronging each other! How mean and wicked to fall upon the peace and rights of a family! Immeasurably more so to fall upon the peace and rights of a nation. Nations must cease to be jealous of each other. They must stand by each other, and never sympathize with an assault upon nationality, unless it be in that rare case where the assault is for the redress of wrongs so flagrant and unendurable, that nothing can be sacred enough to stand in the way of their redress. And then every nation should remember, that it behooves her, for her own safety, to be true to other nations. If England shall, in this hour of my country's calamity, go to the side of my country's enemies, is there not great danger that she will thereby provoke my country to go to the side of England's enemies when England shall in her turn be overtaken by the like calamity?

If I know myself I would deeply sympathize with England, should a part of her Counties take up arms to dismember her. I would call it right for England in that case to fight for "empire": and indeed I know no nation that would in such case fight more earnestly for it. Would'nt you call it right? Nay, would'nt even the eminent statesman, who *reproached* my country with fighting for "empire", call it right for England, if in the circumstances of my country, to fight for "empire?" But if England would be entitled to sympathy in her endeavors to reduce to loyalty her revolting Counties, why is not my country entitled to it in her struggle with revolting States? It is true that the States, which make up my nation, are more important political divisions than the Counties of England—for they are larger, have more administrative power, and have legislative power also. Nevertheless an American State no more than an English County is a nation; and has no more right than an English County to set up for itself.

Britain, France, America and all the nations of the earth should be faithful to each other, and should spare their sympathies for objects worthier than piracies and slaveholding ambition and slaveholding greed. The Rebellion in my country is nothing more nor less than Slavery in arms. The monster had for many years tried to accomplish his infernal objects through the ballot-box and through all sorts of intrigue and corruption. Failing of entire success by these means, he took up arms. But, thank God, the Rebellion is fast going down. Slavery, being identical with it, of course goes down with it. The ending of the Rebellion will necessarily be the ending of Slavery. Not one shred of Slavery will survive the utter extinction of the Rebellion. And let none fear that it will be any where re-established. The people, who have once thrown off Slavery, will never recall it. They will have no desire to exchange the blessings of Liberty for the curse of Slavery. Your West India planters continued, after the Decree of Emancipation, to ask for more money and more favors: but none of them wanted the restoration of Slavery. They had all had enough of that.

Yes, its self-inflicted wound is mortal, and American Slavery must soon die. When it is dead, then, as I trust, will my countrymen, North and South, East and West, having through this war worked out in tears and blood the heavy and Heaven-appointed penalty of their crimes against the black man, penitently and unitedly engage in redressing his matchless wrongs, healing the deep gashes in his spirit, and opening the way wide and generous for his bodily, mental and moral improvement. If this shall come to pass, then will a nation grow up in my land grander and more beautiful than any other nation. This will not be because we are better than other people—for we are not. It will be because nature has dealt more bountifully with us than with any other land. And then will my nation, because it shall have become just to its own people of all classes, conditions and complexions, be relied on, the earth over, to be just to all nations. For, with the change of but one word, we can say to a nation with all the confidence and emphasis with which your greatest of all poets said to an individual:

"To thine own self be true:
And it must follow, as the day the night,
Thou canst not then be false to any *nation*."

LETTER TO HON. D. C. LITTLEJOHN FROM GERRIT SMITH,

ON THE COUNTRY.

Peterboro January 14th 1864.

Hon. Mr. Littlejohn, M. C.,

Dear Sir,

In common with your other constituents I lament your sickness. May you soon regain your health, and the country soon regain your services! This is emphatically a time when the country needs to have every one of her true and intelligent friends at his post.

July 22d 1861 the House of Representatives adopted with but two dissenting voices Mr. Crittenden's Resolution, a part of which is that:

"this war is waged but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease."

This Resolution is in my judgment the greatest and most pernicious of all our mistakes in carrying on the war. From the day of its passage it has never ceased to furnish the Seymours and other enemies of the Administration with their most plausible and effective arguments against the Administration, and with their mightiest influences to obstruct and pervert the war. The Resolution declares war for the Constitution and Union—which it should not have done: and it fails to declare war against the rebels—which alone it should have done. No wonder that with so bad a beginning the nation has not even yet carried on an unconditional war against them!—and no wonder therefore that the war has been so protracted! Should a portion of her people revolt, England would feel that here was something to declare war *against*. She would find no time and feel no disposition to declare war *for* any thing—not even for her chosen form of government—no, nor even for her existence. She would address herself to the one work of subduing the revolt, cost however much it might to what she most cherished. She would go forward to conquer or perish. Very precious, indeed, the interests she would leave behind her. But she would no more suffer them to interfere with the absorbing object before her than would Cortes have suffered his ships to tempt his little army with the possibilities of a safe retreat. He burnt his ships: and she would call for no stipulations in behalf of those interests. To save our Constitution and Union has been our chief object (real and pretended) in this war. Whereas our sole object in it should have been to crush the Rebellion—and this too at whatever needful expense even to the Constitution or the Union. In saying this I surely do not expose myself to the charge of undervaluing either Constitution or Union. For who has written and spoken more than I have for the Constitution, just as it is?—and who has accepted more constantly and cordially all the terms of the Union?

A wise and firm father resolves, uncalculatingly and unconditionally, to put down his rebellious child. If reminded that his family may thereby be broken up, his reply is, that, family or no family, the young rebel shall go down. So too the brave household, whom the burglar awakes, will, if told by him to see to their safety, prefer, at whatever hazard to their safety, to see to his capture. And why should a nation act upon a different principle? No other nation, in the circumstances of ours, ever did. No other nation, ancient or modern, ever furnished a parallel at this point to the conduct of our own. A Rebellion, the most gigantic the world ever saw—the most guilty too, since its only real plea was that under the Constitution there were not sufficient scope and provision for the safety, extension and perpetuity of Slavery—broke out against us. Our one and unconditional work was to put it down. No part of this work was it to save Constitution, Union or Nation. Nay, if, in our struggle to put it down, all these shall perish, their never-to-perish monument would be worth infinitely more to the glory of God and the good of man than could their salvation if achieved by compromise or indirection. Very sacred is nationality. But our sense of its sacredness is shown far less in trying to save a nation than in trying to punish, though at whatever hazard to the nation, the miscreants, who are at work to destroy it.

And now whence comes it that our nation has, at this point, behaved so unlike every other nation? Whence comes it that when Heaven and Earth bade it crush the Rebellion and at whatever cost and without any condition or calculation—whence comes it, I ask, that it turned away from the one and only work it had to do to listen to the traitorous cry: "Save the Constitution: Save the Union!" It comes, I reply, from the simple fact that, from the first, the American people have been artfully, industriously, constantly trained to worship the Constitution and the Union. And what is it that has so successfully called for this training? It is Slavery. By day and by night Slavery has worked to make the American people worshippers of the Constitution and the Union—urging, all the time, its lying claim that the Constitution and the Union were made to uphold, extend and perpetuate Slavery. Only a short and entirely natural step was it to their becoming worshippers of Slavery itself. And, because they took that step, the American people have not yet been able to stand up to a square fight against the Rebellion. For the Rebellion is simply Slavery in arms:—and to their deluded minds Slavery, whether armed or unarmed, being the very pet and cosset of the Constitution and Union, is as much to be cher-

[illegible] protected [illegible] Constitution and Union. The enemy paralyzed the Egyptians when he succeeded in placing between them and himself on the battle field their sacred animals. And why our people could not strike [illegible] Slavery [illegible] well remember that the first concern of our early Commanders in this war was to provide for the safety of Slavery. Nothing had been seen more insane or ridiculous since the days when an Egyptian Army made more account of saving the worshipped cat or crocodile than of conquering the enemy.

Let me refer to some of the evil results of this Congressional Resolution of July 22d 1861, which, as its first and unquoted part shows, was intended to be a Resolution of safety to Slavery instead of destruction to the Rebellion. It estops Congress from complaining of the over-zealous and one-idea Abolitionist, who withholds his hand from the work of putting down the Rebellion unconditionally. It licenses him to substitute for that work the upholding of the Constitution and Union. Moreover, as it virtually licenses him to take his own Abolition way for upholding them, it must not complain if that shall prove an unwise and even wild way. It also estops Congress from complaining of the Pro-Slavery Democrats for their incessant clogging of the wheels of war with their affected cautions for the safety of the Constitution and the Union. For it has itself supplanted the only true issue—the sole and stern issue of the nation with the Rebellion—by a paramount concern for the Constitution and the Union. It is in the name of this very concern that the Seymours and Woods are at work to consummate the ruin of our Republic and to build up a slaveholding oligarchy which will be grateful to all, North as well as South, who, like themselves, love the distinctions of Aristocracy and hate the level of Democracy.

Would that Congress had not taken a ground, which allows certain men to pretend to be against the rebels, when they are not! Would that Congress had declared war against the rebels, and so compelled these certain men to stand forth openly for or against the war! Nay, would that Congress might now, even at this late day, summon the courage to make a clean, unconditional, uncompromising declaration of war—a declaration which shall be *for* nothing; and which shall be *against* the rebels, and against nothing else.

"The Reconstruction of the Government!" For one I am sorry that the public mind should be prematurely occupied with the subject. From the day when the Rebellion began, the nation should have been concerned about nothing else than to put it down: and I add, that until it is put down the nation should be concerned about nothing else than to put it down. We are not so strong and so entirely certain of success that we can afford to be divided amongst ourselves by premature issues. Moreover we shall not know what will be our duty to the conquered South until we shall have conquered her, and seen in what temper the conquest leaves her. As we advance into the enemy's territory let it be subjected to a military or other temporary government: and when, if ever, the whole terrritory shall be ours, then let the terms of a Treaty of Peace, and not a mere Proclamation, say whether the governments and constitutions of that territory shall be as they were before, or shall be so modified as to meet any reasonable demands for their modification. That the Treaty of Peace will have no right to modify them is absurd. That the Constitution will stand in the way of it is ridiculous. When half a nation arms itself against the other half, and throws off the common Constitution, it is for that other half, if victorious, to choose whether it will or will not treat the conquered rebels according to the Constitution. It may, at its own option, treat them as rebels, or as it would foreign enemies. In such circumstances it is bound by no code nor Constitution. It is a law unto itself: and in the light of that law it is to decide what the national welfare calls for. I am free to say that I would have the Treaty revive all the conquered States, and all those rights to which they were formerly entitled under the Constitution. I say it, because I would that they might be found worthy of it. But to repose such confidence in those States were they still impenitent and revengeful, and waiting and longing for another opportunity to strike at the heart of the nation, would be madness; and would be an immeasurable wrong as well toward the conquered as toward the conquerors. The conquered States will be entitled to nothing in virtue of their rights under their former relations. What they have done to break up these relations (,the North is entirely innocent of any thing to this end,) has worked the forfeiture of all those rights. In the name however of wisdom as well as humanity let the Treaty accord to them all that it would be safe for them and for us to have accorded. Let it restore to them gladly and lovingly, *all* the rights of sister States, provided only that, in a sound view of the circumstances, prudence shall not forbid so entire a restoration.

I expressed my preference for a Treaty of Peace. It was proper that Washington should proclaim on what terms a local insurrection in Pennsylvania might be pacified and ended. But I would not leave it even to a Washington to decide on what terms the two halves of a mighty nation should make peace with each other.

The Proclamations! Our President is both a strong and an honest man. Moreover his patriotic heart is firmly set on subduing the Rebellion. Nevertheless, even he, as well as other men, may fall into errors. I do not complain that his Proclamation of Freedom did not cover all the slaves. It covered as many as in his convictions the exigencies of war allowed him to declare free: and he certainly had no moral right to extend his Proclamation beyond those convictions. In his civil capacity he could not liberate a single slave! and in his military capacity he could liberate only so many as there was a military necessity for liberating. What I do complain of is his recognition of the right of the Supreme Court to pass upon that Proclamation. This Court has not the right to say whether it is or is not valid and operative: and I would that Congress might protest unanimously and most solemnly against the President's recognition of it. Let this Court, if it please, take into its hands whatever Proclamations the President may make in his civil capacity. But in regard to all those which he puts forth as Head of the Army, I would say to it: "Hands off?" It is true that it is the Constitution, of which this Court is the acknowledged interpretor, which makes the President the Head of the Army. But it is also

...that it is the LAW OF WAR and not the Constitution, which tells him what he may do in the ... if among his military orders should be one to poison the springs and wells and food in the enemy's ... would our country submit to it, in case the Supreme Court should sanction it? More the less ... of the ... nation would our whole country along with the whole civilized world rise up against the barbarous order. Surely, surely, this Court needs no encouragement to enlarge its powers. The Dred Scott case is of itself sufficient to prove that its tendency is to set no limits to those powers.

Hundreds of thousands are petitioning Congress to abolish what remains of American Slavery. The "Confiscation and Emancipation Bill" left comparatively little of it; and then came the President's Proclamation to make even that little less. I hope Congress will grant the Petition. There are some persons who hold that Congress can, as a civil measure, enact the abolition of Slavery—and this too without providing any indemnity. There are also some, who hold that there can be no legal Slavery under a Constitution which requires "a republican form of government" in all the States, and also requires that: "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law". And there are some persons of such extreme views, as to hold that Slavery, being the matchless crime against God and man, can, no more than murder itself, be legalized by any Constitution or embodied in any real law. But I could wish that Congress might avoid all these questions and abolish Slavery as a war measure, and accompany the abolition with a suitable indemnity to loyal slaveholders.

I notice that the plans for military canals are already coming before Congress, and that an objection to building the canal around Niagara Falls is much urged. It is a taking one, inasmuch as it appeals to local interests and individual selfishness. This objection is, that Western produce, when once afloat on Lake Ontario, will descend the St. Lawrence, and thus be lost to our Cities. And is this an objection? Most certainly, the race of bad logicians is not yet extinct. In the first place, the Government does not propose to build these canals for commerce, but for military protection and advantage. And in the next place, if the Niagara Canal shall give to the immense agricultural West a better market on the St. Lawrence than it can have in Boston, New York or Philadelphia, then ought the whole nation to rejoice in the prospect of the building of that Canal. To get better prices for its produce is of infinitely greater importance to our country than to keep undiminished a few branches of trade in a few of its Cities. Because I have some land in your Oswego I naturally desire to have a share of the vessels laden with Western produce turn into that City, and so benefit her as well as Boston and New York. But it would be very selfish and mean in me to desire this if the produce can find a better market on the St. Lawrence. Rather should I say, let Oswego be deserted; and let Montreal outgrow New York, if she can do so by attracting the produce and increasing the wealth of our farmers. But I apprehend that the great West will be sadly disappointed, if she expects by means of the Niagara Canal to have a better market on the St. Lawrence, which for half the year is closed with ice, than she can have elsewhere. If this is her expectation from that Canal, then so far she is unwise in calling for the building of it. That Canal will be an important military work: but it will bring comparatively little to the markets of Canada.

And I also notice, that there is a movement in Congress to terminate the Reciprocity Treaty—that Treaty which, you remember, I worked so hard for when I was a Member of Congress. I hope that my country will not be guilty of the illiberality and unsound political economy of refusing to exchange natural productions with any country. The complaint is, that Canada sells too much to us. But if she is profited by selling to us, so are we by buying of her. If the lumberman in Maine cannot get as much for his lumber under the "Reciprocity Treaty," there is nevertheless a full equivalent in the fact that the builder in Ohio buys his Canada lumber far cheaper because of that Treaty. If it is a gain to sell dear so it is also a gain to buy cheap. We have now free access to the vast and rich forests of Canada. What a folly to cut ourselves off from this advantage for the miserable reason, that Canada enjoys a corresponding advantage!—that whilst we reap the profit of buying her lumber, she reaps the profit of selling it to us! But it is held, that the price of our wheat, as well as of our lumber, is reduced by this Canada competition. Can it, however, make any material difference to our farmers, whether Canada wheat goes to Liverpool by the St. Lawrence or by New York and Boston? Both our country and Canada grow a surplus of wheat: and hence, in the case of both, the price is regulated by the foreign market. Canada wheat will come into competition with ours, whether we do, or do not, continue to enjoy the advantage of transporting it across our country. Why then should we surrender this advantage? And it is also held that free Canada coal cheapens the price of ours. The more the better declare reason and humanity! And in response to this declaration all the people, including especially the shivering poor, cry: "Amen!"

I close with inquiring—who they are that clamor for Tariffs and the termination of the "Reciprocity Treaty?" They are few else than the comparative handful, who desire higher prices for what they have to sell. The masses, and especially the poor who make up so large a share of the masses, desire low prices. In, then, their name and behalf let us favor, not the policy which makes dear, but that which makes cheap, the necessaries of life!

Your friend

GERRIT SMITH.

GERRIT SMITH TO HIS NEIGHBORS.

15.

WAR GOES BEYOND CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS.

DOWN WITH THE REBELLION AT WHATEVER COST TO THE CONSTITUTION.

"THE BODY IS MORE THAN RAIMENT!" THE COUNTRY IS MORE THAN THE CONSTITUTION.

THIS NOW FOR NOTHING BUT TO CRUSH THE REBELLION.

"Damn the Constitution!" said one in the hearing of myself and several others. I had always disliked profanity; and I had always honored the Constitution—welcoming every part of it. Nevertheless this exclamation was music in my ears. Why was it? It was because of the connexion and spirit in which it burst from the speaker. He was arguing with rapid and fervid eloquence that the Government should ply every possible means for the speediest crushing of the Rebellion—when a listening Conservative threw in the qualification: "But all according to the Constitution!" No wonder that the speaker could not brook this interruption. No wonder that an oath should leap forth to attest the indignation of his patriotic soul. It was not contempt for the Constitution, but displeasure at the thrusting of it in his way, which prompted the profanity. Had it been the Bible itself, that was thus impertinently cited, an oath might still have been the consequence.

In a past century a New England puritan, in order to reconcile his black boy to the periodical whippings he gave him, said: "I whip you for the good of your soul." To which the sufferer very naturally replied: "I wish I hadn't a soul!" Often during this War has the excessively tender and untimely care for the Constitution tempted me to wish that we hadn't a Constitution. Thus was I tempted when, July 22 1861, the House of Representatives, instead of manfully resolving that the War was for putting down the Rebellion and for nothing else, meanly resolved that it was for maintaining the supremacy of the Constitution. Thus was I tempted when Congress, a year or two ago, was ridiculously employed in looking into the Constitution to learn how far it might confiscate the possessions of the millions, who were striking at the life of the nation. I notice that, now again, Congress is, in this same connexion, twattling about the Constitution. Thus was I tempted when the President left it to the Judges, or in other words to the Constitution, to say whether Proclamations, which he had issued as Head of the Army, should be allowed to stand. Unhappiest and most contemptible of all nations are we if, whilst every other nation can carry on War with all the latitude of the Law of War—of the Law of Necessity and of self-preservation we are to be "cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd" by a mere paper. Infinitely better that we had no Constitution than that we should have one, which is allowed to fetter our freedom and restrict our choice of means in time of War.

By the way, the most cheering instance of resistance to this practice of supplanting the Law of War with the Constitution is the recent disclaimer of the Supreme Court in Vallandigham's Case of authority to review the proceedings of a Military Commission.

Never yet have we carried on an unconditional and square fight with the Rebels: and never can we until we shall have the political and moral courage to resent and rise above the endeavors of demagogues and sympathizers with the Rebels to embarrass our conduct of the War by those impertinent Constitutional questions. But these questions are not the only hinderance in the way of the only proper mode of warfare. Another and not less serious hinderance has sprung up in the untimely agitation of the question: "Who shall be the next President?" It is fearful to think how mighty are the electioneering influences, which will now be set at work by office-holders, office-seekers, army contractors and many other classes. It is fearful to think how wide-spread and deep a concern there will be to conduct the War, not so as to end the Rebellion and save the country, but so as to promote party and individual interests. It is fearful to think of the possible extent and character of the divisions that may now be wrought amongst ourselves—divisions that may do more than the enemy can do to destroy our beloved country. Who shall be the next President should not have been spoken of before midsummer. The New York Independent says it should only have been thought of. But it should not even have been thought of before that time. In the judgment of this Journal, to be thinking from this early day of the Presidential Election—"to be prudently considering it"—to "ponder" it—would be the people's best preparation for acting wisely in it. But their unspeakably better preparation would be to forget the whole subject for the coming four or five months and to be during all that time united as one man in wiping out the last remains of the accursed Rebellion. Such a perfect union for such a righteous end would be their best possible education for selecting none but a fit man for the Presidency.

Quite a natural fruit of this premature agitation of the Presidential question is it, that there are already on the one hand Union men who are slandering and vilifying Abraham Lincoln, and on the other hand Union men who will not tolerate even the most generous and friendly criticism on any of his views and measures.

And still another hinderance has been thrown in our way. The proposition to amend the Constitution tends to produce divisions amongst ourselves, and to divert us from that one work which should absorb us—the work of crushing the Rebellion. It is said that for the safety of posterity and to prevent the recurrence of the Rebellion we must have a Constitutional prohibition of Slavery. I reply that we cannot afford to attend to posterity now—that our own case needs all our present attention. It will be time enough to amend the Constitution after we shall have ended the Rebellion. The leisure which Peace affords, is necessary to devise and adopt amendments of that precious Paper. I do not object to the abolishing of Slavery. No sooner had Slavery fired at Sumter than Emancipation should have fired at Slavery. And this too, Constitution or no Constitution for it. It was our right, because our necessity, to kill that which aimed to kill the nation. At no time since the War began should Congress have delayed to abolish by force of its War Power every remnant of Slavery:—dealing generously at the same time with loyal slaveholders.

Moreover as to guarding posterity from Slavery and therefore from a war for Slavery, I would say that the land once cleared of it, Slavery will never again be set up in it. Slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease, which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When a few years ago Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce Slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from Slavery and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against Slavery will not avail to keep out Slavery from the Southern States: but the freedom and the arms

we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want Slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against Slavery. But the people wanted Slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting, to it. Hence they fell in with the Pro-Slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it. Reasons it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against Slavery. Certainly it is:—for it says: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law": and "No State shall pass any Bill of attainder". But Slavery is the most emphatic and abominable attainder. And it says too: "The United States *shall* guarantee to every State in the Union a Republican form of Government". Has South Carolina, where a handful of tyrants own three-fifths of all the people, a *Republican* form of Government? Surely we cannot admit it without being ashamed that our nation has a Republican name.

I close with the remark, that now is not the time either to improve the Constitution, or to be solicitous to save it; that now is not the time, much as they are needed, to be building Roads to the Pacific, or indeed to be making any expenditures or embarking in any projects, whose results will not be early enough to help us in this War; and that not only now is not the time for President-making but not the time to maintain the Democratic Party, nor to revive the Republican Party and seek thereby to harness to a platform built four years ago and in far other circumstances a nation which is solving, through seas of tears and blood, the question of her life or death. I thought that the Republican Party was disbanded. The assurances that it was—were they mistaken or deceitful? Tens of thousands of men, not Republicans, have worked with Republicans to put down the Rebellion. But they cannot turn away from that work to any other:—nor can they consent to couple with it the building up of the Republican or any other Party.

Pittsburgh, February 21, 1864.

16.

GERRIT SMITH

ON THE FORT PILLOW AND PLYMOUTH MASSACRES.

THE IMMEDIATE ORIMINALS NOT ALWAYS THE ONLY CRIMINALS.
THE CREATORS OF A WICKED PUBLIC SENTIMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS RESULTS.
PATRIOTISM, AND NOT PARTY POLITICS, OUR PRESENT NEED.
NO TAXES TOO HEAVY, IF NEEDED TO PUT DOWN THE REBELLION.

The whole civilized world will be startled and horrified by this slaughter of probably not less than five or six hundred persons. The excuse in the case of a part of the slaughtered is that they were traitorous citizens of the Confederacy: in the case of another part that they were whites fighting by the side of blacks: in the case of the remainder, including women and even children, that they were blacks. That these were blacks was cause enough why, though numbering three or four hundred, they should be murdered—murdered in utter contempt of all the sacred rights of prisoners of war. *It is of the crime against these I would now speak.*

Who are to be held amenable for this crime? The rebels. Yes, but not the rebels only. The authorship of this crime, so matchless in its worst features, is very comprehensive. The responsibility for it is wider than our notion. England shares in the authorship and responsibility, because it was she who planted slavery in America, and because it is slavery out of which this crime has come. Our own nation however is the far guiltier one. The guilt of this crime is upon all her people who have contributed to that public sentiment, which releases white men from respecting the rights of black men. Our highest Court says that this satanic sentiment prevailed in the early existence of our nation. Certain it is that it has prevailed in all the later periods of that existence. Who are they who have contributed to generate it? All who have held that blacks are unfit to sit by the side of whites in the church, the school, the car and at the table. All who have been in favor of making his complexion shut one's black man from the ballot-box. All who have been for making a man's title to any of the rights of manhood turn on the color of the skin in which his Maker has chosen to wrap him. All in short who have hated or despised the black man.

Even President Lincoln, whom God now blesses and will yet more bless for the much he has done for his black brethren, is not entirely innocent of the Fort Pillow and Plymouth massacres. Had his plan of "Reconstruction" recognized the right of the black man to vote, it would thereby have contributed to lift them up above outrage, instead of contributing as it now does to invite outrage upon them. By the way it is a pity that he undertook "Reconstruction." It was entirely beyond his civil capacity to do so: and it was entirely beyond his military capacity to have a part in setting up any other than a military or provisional government. Moreover this is the only kind of government which it is proper to set up in the midst of War. The leisure and advantages of Peace are necessary in the great and difficult work of establishing a permanent government. In this connexion let me advert for a moment to the doctrine: "Once a State always a State"—a doctrine so frequently wielded against "Reconstruction" on any terms. Where is the authority for this doctrine? In the Constitution, it is said. But no where does the Constitution say that a State may plunge into War, secure at all hazards from some of the penalties of War. But amongst the penalties of War is whatever change the conqueror may choose to impose upon the conquered territory. I admit that it is very desirable to have all the revolting States re-established—restated. But that there is any law by which this becomes inevitable is absurd. No where does the Constitution say that a State is to be exempt from the operation of the law of War. No where does it undertake to override the law of War. How clear is it then that by this paramount law these revolted States will, when conquered, lie at the will of the conqueror! And how clear is it that it will then turn not at all upon the Constitution, but upon this will of the conqueror backed by this paramount law of War, whether the old Statehood of these States shall be revived, or whether they shall be remanded to a Territorial condition and put upon their good behavior!

There is another instance in which the President has contributed to that cruel public sentiment, which leaves the black race unprotected. I refer to his so strangely long delay in promising protection to the black soldier, and to the even longer, and not yet ended, delay in affording it. The President is a humane as well as an honest man; and the only explanation I can find for his delay to protect the black soldier and to put an end, so far as in him lies, to the various, innumerable, incessant outrages upon the freedmen is in the continuance of his childish and cowardly desire to conciliate his native Kentucky and the Democratic Party.

I argued that even President Lincoln is responsible in some degree for that public sentiment, which invites outrage upon the black man and leaves him a prey to the wicked. Those Members of Congress, who are opposing the reasonable measure of letting the black man vote in the Territories, are also guilty of favoring that public sentiment which broke out in the crime at Fort Pillow and Plymouth. Similarly guilty are those Members who would make the pay of a black soldier less than that of a white one. And so are those Members who consent to leave a Fugitive Slave Statute in existence. In a word, all should tax their consciences with the sin of this public sentiment and with the resulting crime at Fort Pillow and Plymouth, whose influence, by either word or deed, has been to keep up in this heathen land the caste-spirit—that pre-eminent characteristic of heathenism. I call this a heathen land. To the Christ-Religion—that simple religion of equal rights and of doing as you would be done by—there can be no greater insult than to call a nation in which, as in this, the most cruel and murderous caste-spirit prevails, a christian nation.

Both on the right hand and on the left I hear that our nation is to be saved. But my fears that it will not often become very strong. That the Rebellion is to be crushed, I deeply believe. Often in the course of Providence a wicked people, which is itself to be afterward destroyed, is previously to be used in destroying another and generally more wicked people. There are striking illustrations of this in the Bible. The duty of Abolitionists and Anti-Abolitionists, Democrats and Republicans to work unitedly, incessantly and unconditionally for the overthrow of the Rebellion I have not only never doubted, but ever urged. I hold it to be unpatriotic

AN APPEAL TO PATRIOTISM.

OUR GOVERNMENT LACK NEITHER MONEY NOR MEN.

To the People of the Town of Smithfield.

Ever since this guiltiest of all Rebellions began, our supreme duty to God and Man has been to help put it down. During all this time we have had no right to be such Democrats or such Republicans or such Abolitionists or such any thing else, as would in the slightest degree interfere with the faithful discharge of this paramount duty.

To lend the Government men and to lend it money are the principal ways in which we can help it overthrow the Rebellion. In both these ways we have done something—but not enough. Every person, who has fifty dollars to spare, should lend it to the Government. He will get a liberal interest, and the punctual repayment of the principal. Backed as its Bonds are by the boundless resources of this great nation, they cannot fail of being paid. But the loans to our Government should be made far less in the spirit of gain than of patriotism—since it needs them to sustain itself in its life and death struggle with these multitudinous and demoniac rebels. Moreover, in making such loans we are doing the very best thing for our property. For our country lost, all is lost. Of no value to us then is a large property. But our country saved, we are rich in her salvation; and the more we shall have reduced our possessions by our generous efforts to save her, the richer we shall feel ourselves to be. A little with a country is more than much without a country. The secret of getting truly rich is not in hoarding but in using. Whoever has put his possessions to good use is truly rich. Whoever has withheld them from such use is truly poor.

Thousands of brave men have gone from our County to face the foe. A thousand more should go. And they must go soon, if they would help bring an end to the Rebellion, the present year. A Madison County Regiment should be raised forthwith. Our little Town's share of it would be between thirty and forty men. Let us make immediate efforts to find them: and let the people of Smithfield assemble in the Village of Peterboro at 2 o'clock P. M. Wednesday 18th instant to decide how large a Bounty they will pay them, and in what way they will raise it.

By obtaining these men *now* we shall accomplish two objects—1st we shall exempt our Town from the approaching Draft: 2d we shall afford more seasonable help to our beloved and imperilled country.

Peterboro July 2d 1864.

JAMES BARNETT,
CALEB CALKINS,
CHA'S D. MILLER,
E. D. BACON,
GERRIT SMITH.

GERRIT SMITH

TO THE RANK AND FILE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

Peterboro October 20th 1864.

To the members of the Democratic Party,

I have faith that you will hear me—1st because I am an old man and past being suspected of seeking personal political advantage; 2d because being no partisan and having never belonged to the Democratic, Whig nor Republican Party, I am not liable to the charge of seeking party objects.

You, like all multitudes of men, love justice and love your country. Nevertheless this does not assure me that, in the approaching Election, you will be faithful to either. For, trained as you are to implicit confidence in the leaders of your Party, there is but too much reason to fear that you will follow them even now, when to follow them is to be their instruments in outraging righteousness and ruining your country.

In the breasts of politicians where ambition, the greed of gain and the lust of place and power have usually so much play, justice and patriotism are apt to become weak. But in the breasts of *your* political leaders these virtues seem to have become absolutely extinct. Step by step they have gone on courting and conceding to the Slave Power, until at last they are so debauched as to be no longer capable of withholding any thing from its claims. When the South at the instigation of that Power broke out in this Rebellion against a Nation, which had done her no harm, save the harm of weakly and wickedly indulging her and succumbing to her, these leaders were as yet able to make, or at least to seem to make, some resistance. But now they have got so far along in the way of evil as distinctly to take the side of the Rebellion; as openly and shamelessly to join the Rebels, and employ every art to induce you also to join them.

For proof that your leaders have gone over to the enemy I refer not to the obvious fact that they are at work with him to defame, embarrass and destroy our Government; to the obvious fact that the spirit of the Democratic Press in Philadelphia, New York, Boston and elsewhere is one with the spirit of the Southern Press; to the obvious fact that your leaders rejoice with the South in her successes, and sorrow with her in her defeats; to the obvious fact that, whilst the South shoots and starves our soldiers, your leaders, in denouncing the Drafts and in various other ways, hinder the replenishing of our wasted armies; and, by impeaching the credit and cheapening the bonds of the Government, enfeeble its prosecution of the War; nor to the obvious fact that they are equally intent with the South on upholding Slavery, which is the one cause of the Rebellion. Nor have I reference to the obvious fact that the South identifies the cause of the Democratic Party with her own cause, and that whilst she looks to our coming Election as fraught with triumph or ruin to her Rebellion, she also regards her own fortune as decisive of the fate of that Party. Says the Charleston Courier: "Our success in battle insures the success of McClellan. Our failure will inevitably lead to his defeat."

But there is evidence far more conclusive than any or all of this which I have cited that the leaders of your Party have identified themselves with the Rebellion. God grant that they may not succeed in identifying you also with it! Go with me to the Chicago Convention. Look at the Platform which it built, or rather which it adopted—for it was probably mainly built on the British side of the Niagara, if not indeed in Richmond. It says nothing against the South. It abounds in complaints of the North. It is at Peace with the South and at War with the North. It pronounces the War on our part a failure—and this too when the South is reduced to far less than half the territory she began the Rebellion with, and our final success seems so near at hand. It calls for the stopping of the War. But a poorer time is it to *stop* than "to swap horses when crossing the stream." More is the danger that they will be swept down stream. To stop the War now is to forego the object of the War—the deliverance of the Nation from threatened death. To stop it now is to lose all the blood and treasure it has cost. To stop it now is to make vain and to leave uncompensed the bereavements and desolations which tens of thousands of our families have suffered from it. And for what end could the War be stopped now, but to abandon it and to leave the Rebellion to triumph? Is it said that opportunity will thus be afforded for the calm and wise consideration of the questions between the North and South? But there are no questions between them—and there can be none until the South has laid down her arms. Until then she has no right to be heard, and we have no right to hear her. Until then neither party has the right to propose conditions of Peace. The South took up arms without cause. She must lay them down without conditions. Until then any negotiations with her—even such *quasi* negotiations, as our excellent President has in the weakness of his goodness countenanced—would be at the expense of dishonoring justice and compromising the dignity and sacredness of nationality. Gen. McClellan thinks "we should exhaust all the resources of statesmanship to secure Peace." But until Peace there is nothing for statesmanship to act on. Until then it must be *generalship* instead of statesmanship, *fighting* instead of negotiation. Afterward many questions will arise in the province of statesmanship: and, I trust, that our Government will be disposed to treat them all justly and, where need be, generously also.

It will be held by some that there is one question between the North and the South, even whilst they are at War with each other. It is that of exchanging prisoners. But I do not see that even here there is room for a question. By the laws of War neither party to the War can be required to consent to an exchange of prisoners. Each may retain all its prisoners to the end of the War. If the South does, for any reasons, value her black prisoners too highly to consent to exchange them for her white men in our hands, so be it, and we have no right to complain. If she consents to however limited an exchange of prisoners, black or white, we are to thank her, and for humanity's sake to rejoice. The wrong treatment of prisoners is another subject, and one with which this should not be complicated, nor on which it should in the slightest degree be made to depend. If the South shall abuse any of her prisoners—if, for instance, she shall starve or kill, or, what is worse, sink them in Slavery, it is for us and us only to decide what shall be the return or retaliation for the outrage. All this however has nothing to do with the exchange of prisoners.

But to return from this digression. We were speaking of the Chicago Platform. One of the things which the Convention did after adopting it, was to put George H. Pendleton upon it. Pre-eminently fitted to it is he. Vallandingham himself could not be more so. From the first, Pendleton has been openly on the side of the Rebels. On the floor of Congress in January 1861, when several States had already seceded, he denied our right to compel the return of a seceding State. In harmony with this denial his subsequent votes have been against condemning the Rebellion and against providing means for carrying on the War to suppress it. This is the Rebel, whom your leaders would have you try to make Vice President. Can you try it without becoming Rebels

yourselves? He is the exponent of the Chicago Platform. In the light of his Speeches and Votes whatever is obscure or doubtful in that Platform becomes clear and certain. Can you consent to commit the Democratic Party to a Platform so entirely in the interest of the Rebellion?

You perhaps wonder that I have omitted to mention the nomination of McClellan. But I was describing and illustrating the Chicago Platform: and his nomination has nothing to do with that Peace Platform. His name was chosen, not to represent the Platform, but as the bait for catching the votes of War Democrats. It was a trick—as base a trick as the Baltimore Convention would have been guilty of, had it baited for Peace votes by putting a non-resistant Quaker on its thorough War Platform. I grant that the nomination of McClellan was a very cunning trick. For whilst, on the one hand, his having had a part in the War would commend him to the votes of War Democrats, that part, on the other hand, was so equivocal, so tender and advantageous to the enemy, as not to deter Peace Democrats from voting for him.

And now what are the arguments, which the leaders of the Democratic Party, its orators and presses, employ to bring you to abandon the cause of your country and to identify yourselves with the Rebels? Only two which they greatly rely on, or which it is worth while for me to notice. The first is the perversion of the War from the putting down of the Rebellion to the putting down of Slavery. The second is the cost of carrying on the War—the cost in money and the cost in life.

1st. I do not deny that one-idea Abolitionists desired the perversion. But I do deny that their desire was gratified. From first to last, the Government has withstood all the clamor and all the influence for the perversion.

The leading doctrine of that admirable letter of August 22d 1862 from President Lincoln to Horace Greeley, in which he shows his clear understanding of the limitations upon his military power is, that he would emancipate slaves no farther than he sees it to be a necessity for saving his country. Surely this doctrine does not justify the charge of perverting the War.

The President's Proclamation of September 22d 1862 sets out with the declaration "that hereafter as heretofore the War will be prosecuted for the object of practically restoring the Constitutional relation," &c. No perversion of the War in this declaration. But this Proclamation contains a threat of Emancipation! Yes, but the threat is to be fulfilled only in case the Rebels refuse to lay down their arms. Does such a threat pervert the War? So far from it it is in the very line of the original and legitimate War. His Proclamation of January 1st 1863 does, so far as it can, fulfil this threat. Did the fulfillment pervert the War? Oh no! It weakened the foe and strengthened ourselves. It gave us new means for carrying on the War against him, and, like all our previous means for carrying it on, they have been faithfully used to that one end.

But your leaders tell you that the War has been perverted by bringing black men into the Army. I doubt not that many of these black men are inspired with the hope that the putting down of the Rebellion will be the putting down of Slavery. All the fiercer therefore will they fight to put down the Rebellion. Hence no perversion of the War need be feared at their hands: and so far from encouraging the cry of perversion we should be thankful that scores of thousands of these brave and stalwart black men are found willing to help us release our country from the bloody grasp of Rebels. Thankful should we be to these defenders of our homes that they save us from the necessity of defending them ourselves. A hundred thousand black soldiers save fifty thousand Unionists and fifty thousand Democrats from being soldiers. I do not deny that it is a great trial to the Southern chivalry, with whom your leaders so tenderly sympathize, to have to fight with negroes. I do not deny that it must be very humiliating and exasperating to Southern gentlemen to find themselves confronted on the battle-field by their former slaves. But before taking up arms to destroy the best form of Government the world ever saw and to dismember a nation that had never done them the least harm, they should have foreseen that, sooner than consent to perish under their parricidal blows, we would summon to our aid red and black as well as white men. Much and hastily as we had, in the past, studied to please the slaveholders, they should have foreseen that when the alternative before us was to save their pride or save our country, we could not long hesitate which to choose.

2d. The other argument of your leaders why you should abandon the War and join the Rebels is, as I have said, the cost of carrying on the War. I admit the cost is great. Still is it not better for us to go through with the War, and to reach final victory as we can do in a few months, and as a united North, incursed with disloyal demagogues and disloyal Generals, could have done more than two years ago? In that case we should have but our own debt to pay; and no small share of that we should be enabled to pay from confiscation of the estates of the wealthy men involved in the Rebellion. The possessions of the poor we would be too pitiful and generous to molest. But in the event of the success of the Democratic Party at the coming Election and of the consequent immediate stopping of the War, or in other words of the abandonment of the War, or in still other words of the success of the Rebellion, the doctrines of State-Sovereignty and State-Secession would be triumphant. Then the whole Democratic Party would declare with George H. Pendleton that our Government has no right to coerce Seceded States; and then it would also declare that we are equitably bound to pay those States all the expense we have put them to in resisting our unconstitutional coercion. Thus, by giving up the War we should, instead of staying the increase of our debt, double it; and instead of our getting remuneration from the South, she would get remuneration from the North.

As to life,—we would, it is true, stay the loss of it by stopping the War. But the War stopped now, or at any time before the Rebellion is subdued, would speedily break out afresh, and lead to a sacrifice of life many fold greater than would be necessary to prosecute it to a decisive result from our present vantage-ground.

I am not however willing to argue this point on this low ground only. I hold that we must, at whatever cost, carry on the War to final victory or final defeat. It is a case where we have no option, and no right to stop to count the cost. We must persevere until we have subdued the Rebellion or been subdued by it. If need be we must persevere until men and money and credit shall all fail us. Infinitely honorable would it be for our nation to exhaust herself and perish in her struggle to crush this most infernal of all Rebellions. But immoral to the last degree and forever would she be, were she to consent to prolong her life by a compromise with the guiltiest of Rebels and by recognizing their nationality alongside of her own. Our nation can afford to die an honorable death—but she cannot afford to live a dishonorable life.

Your leaders say that we cannot pay our present debt. The mineral wealth of the country is sufficient to pay it in thirty years. Our gold and silver mines will yield the present year more than a hundred millions of dollars. By the time we shall have reached the fourth or fifth year of Peace they will yield double this sum. Scarcely less will be the yield of our iron, copper, lead, tin, quicksilver, salt and coal.

Your leaders seek to alarm you by telling you that rich England groans under a debt scarcely twice as large as our own. How idle to compare England's productiveness with our own!—little England with this Nation, which stretches from sea to sea—little England that half a century hence will not have one-third of the

population we shall then have. Of course, I am not taking into the account her Colonies. These gratify her pride and ambition; but they do little toward helping her pay debts. Is her trade with them lucrative? So would it be were they not her Colonies.

And, to make our prospect the more gloomy and despairing, your leaders dwell on our Town and County Bounty-money burdens. But so far from regarding as burdens the Bounties we give those who arm themselves for our defence, we should rejoice in their wealth-distributing and wealth-equalizing office. They take from those who have, to give to those who have not, and to those too whose patriotic and perilous services cannot be overpaid. What right-minded person does not rejoice when seeing those Bounty moneys procure homes for families who never before had homes?—and when seeing these families lifted up for the first time to a comfortable grade of living? Your leaders speak of the aggregate of these Bounty moneys as so much that the Nation has parted with and lost. But it is still in the Nation to help pay her debts with—and what is more, it is in hands where it does far greater good than it did before. In this connection let me add that a very considerable share of the great debt, which the Government owes, is for profits, which have been realized in the Contracts made with it and in the purchase of its Bonds. These profits, like the Bounty moneys, are still in the Nation, and, like them, will help the Nation pay its debt. Moreover it is these profits, which have, during the War, so stimulated the industry of the Nation, and given such unprecedented prosperity to all its branches.

But what, you will inquire, can be the motive of the Democratic leaders in bringing their Party to the side of the Rebellion? I answer that it is the same with that which prompted the Rebellion—in other words that the motive is *to save slavery*. The authors of the Rebellion—of the greatest crime of all the nations and all the ages—saw that the progressive civilization of Christendom boded destruction to Slavery. They saw that it was cast out of Europe; that it was nearly extinct in her Colonies; that it was tottering in Brazil; and becoming more hateful in our Northern States. Hence they resolved to insulate themselves and their Slavery. In order to keep fast, forever fast, the chains upon a race as innocent as hapless, they undertook to build up around both slaves and masters the walls of a new nationality;—walls so high that the outside and growing Anti-Slavery sentiment could not leap over—walls so impervious that it could not pass through. Herein and herein alone is the explanation of the Rebellion.

Now, as the slaveholders have their life—the life of their ease and luxury and ambition and tyranny—the life of all their habits—in Slavery, so also the Democratic Party had, from its long-continued alliance with slaveholders and long-continued dependence upon them, come to have its life in Slavery. Hence the leaders of that Party, though, at the first, quite generally opposed to the Rebellion, came to sympathize with it as soon as they saw that its downfall involved the downfall of Slavery. For they well knew that when Slavery should die the Democratic Party would also die. Blessed be God that Slavery is to die! Blessed be God that it is to die, if it be only that the most demoralizing and devilish of all the political Parties, which ever cursed mankind, is to die with it! The approaching Election will cast into a common grave, and that grave too deep to allow of a resurrection, Slavery, Rebellion and the Democratic Party. Doubtless there will still be a Democratic Party. But it will not be the Devil which this one is—for it will be dissevered from Slavery.

I frequently see in the Democratic newspapers extracts from the speeches and writings of such men as Daniel S. Dickinson, Benjamin F. Butler and Lyman Tremain. These extracts are to prove that they were once as Pro-Slavery as are the remaining leaders of the Democratic Party. But this is as unreasonable and shameless as for remaining drunkards to reproach reformed drunkards with their former history and habits. For one, I honor and love such men as Dickinson and Butler and Tremain, and should be glad so see them advanced to higher and higher places of trust and power. For notwithstanding they were, in common with the other leaders of their Party, victims of the most abominable political education, they had conscience enough left to stand aghast at the culminating wickedness of their Party, and to quit their Party;—or, if you prefer involving them in personal as well as Party guilt, conscience enough left to stand aghast at their own wickedness, and to repent of it and forsake it. Alas, this pride of consistency; this pride in never changing! How vulgar and vicious and vile it is! When will it be seen, that the duty of all of us—of even the best of us—is to be ever and ever changing, be it only toward the right! When will it be seen, that man is amongst his best and sublimest employments, when writing with his own finger condemnation upon his own erring and guilty past! Dickinson and Butler and Tremain had the courage to change. They stepped upward, and saved themselves, and became saviors of their country. To remain where they were would have been to remain destroyers of themselves and their country.

I stated the arguments with which your leaders ply you, and by force of which they hope to bring you to the side of the Rebels. The first one appeals to those prejudices against the black man, which they have so industriously and, alas, so successfully cultivated in you. They hope that, under the sway of those strong prejudices, you would rather that the Rebellion should triumph than that the slave should go free. But have you not hated him long enough! He is denied all right to learning and honors and child and wife and himself and his earnings. And yet his despised black skin covers a heart as warm to all these relations and interests as does your own proud white one. Tell your leaders, I beseech you—your tempters and seducers—that their appeal to your hatred of the negro will be vain. Tell them that he has suffered long enough; that you have hated and wronged him long enough; and that you are more disposed to repent of your part in crushing him than to persist in it. Tell them, in a word, that you have come to believe more in your obligation to honor God and all the varieties of the human family than in your obligation to serve ambitious and greedy demagogues.

The other argument, which, I said, your leaders employ to bring you to join the Rebels is the cost of carrying on the War. Their hope of success at this point is in your selfishness and lack of patriotism. They flatter themselves that you had rather lose the country than have your property taxed to save it: and that, rather than let your sons go, or go yourselves into the hardships and perils of War, you would let the Rebellion and Slavery sweep over and blast the whole land. Disappoint them here also, I entreat you. Tell them that of all the claims, which earth can make upon your property, that, which your imperilled country makes upon it, is paramount. Tell them that to be poor and yet have a country is to be rich—whilst to be rich and yet to be stripped of country is to be poor. Tell them too that you have laid your sons and yourselves upon the altar of your country, and that you count death in her service not as dreadful, but as blessed.

How elevating and ennobling is this War to all who have a heart to go forth to its unselfish, patriotic and sublime duties! But how sinking and shrivelling is it to all those, who shrink from these duties, and prefer to cower in their cowardice, and to shut themselves in the shell of their selfishness!

GERRIT SMITH.

GERRIT SMITH TO WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

19

THE THEOLOGIES THE GREAT ENEMIES OF RELIGION.
THE THEOLOGIES THE GREAT HINDERANCES TO JUSTICE AND REFORM.
THE THEOLOGIES THE GREAT CURSE OF MANKIND.

PETERBORO February 22d 1855.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Boston,

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I see in the Newspapers a Bill of Sale of "two negro slaves, which slaves were lately the proper goods of the said Jonathan Edwards deceased." It is subscribed by Timothy Dwight Jr. and Timothy Edwards the Executors. This Jonathan Edwards was the celebrated elder President Edwards, and this Timothy Edwards was his son.

Of the President's purchase and treatment of the black boy Titus you have doubtless often heard. Mrs. Mason Whiting of Binghamton, daughter of the aforesaid Timothy, has twice told me the particulars. The last time, only sixteen months ago, I wrote them as they came from her lips. This excellent lady, although 85 years old, is still blest with a healthy body and a healthy brain.

Titus was eight years old when the President bought him, and fifteen when the President died and left him still in slavery. The President allowed him no education. Mrs. Whiting's father, who inherited him, allowed him none. Although he lived to old age, poor Titus could never read. He was however remarkable for his good sense and integrity.

Now, how can it be explained that President Edwards was a slaveholder?—was this unqualified, unmitigated, unrelenting slaveholder?

1st. It was not because he was a man of weak intellect. A stronger one there was not perhaps in all America.

2d. It was not because he was an ignorant man—for he abounded in learning.

3d. It was not because his conscience was dull. No man had a more wakeful or tender one.

4th. It was not because he had a shallow sense of justice. Who had a deeper?

For none of these reasons was it that he stood in this guilty relation. He stood in it solely because his theology called for or permitted the relation, and because with him the claims of theology were paramount to all other claims. Had his theology forbidden slavery, he would have been an intensely earnest abolitionist. I, of course, speak of his theology as he, and not as others, viewed its teachings at this point. His son, the younger President Edwards, was such an abolitionist. But he would have been as pro-slavery as was his father had he interpreted his theology to be pro-slavery. For the son, like the father, set theological above natural obligations, and was devoted to theological rather than to natural justice. Both of them, like the great mass of religionists, confounding theology with religion, made it the supreme work of life to wrest nature into conformity with religion instead of letting religion grow into conformity with nature. Or rather, I might say, instead of being intent on that true religion, which is obedience to nature, they were intent on one, which, like every other false religion, is antagonistic to her.

Edwards' theology was his justification for being a slaveholder. The curse upon Canaan, or the permission to buy bondmen and bondmaids, or something else in his theology he construed into such justification. Calvin's theology was his justification for consenting to the burning of Servetus. Her theology made it the duty of the Church to condemn Galileo. It was their theology that prompted the managers of the Inquisition to kill scores of thousands and torture hundreds of thousands. Earnest and conscientious and sublime souls were Edwards and Calvin and also many of these managers. I cannot join with those, who pass upon them an unqualified and sweeping condemnation. Their errors, although so horrible, were nevertheless far more of the head than of the heart. They were educated to set theology above nature, and to enforce theological justice at whatever expense to natural justice; and, alas! they were but too faithful to their education. Thus kindly too would I judge my neighbors, my countrymen, and, in short, the people of both christendom and heathendom—for the vast majorities of them have been taught the supreme obligation of their theologies. Their belief in miracles shows that they set their theologies above nature—for miracles are the grossest possible outrage upon nature. Drownings in the Ganges and crushings under the wheels of Juggernaut come of theologies, which war upon nature. So too do the denying of equal rights to woman, and the allowing of polygamy and slavery. And emphatically unnatural is the doctrine that another can relieve us of the penalty of our own transgressions;—the obvious doctrine of nature at this point being: "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Others may suffer for the sinner: but he too must suffer.

Within the last few weeks there have been in the adjoining County of Oneida a couple of very lamentable instances of the subordination, or rather sacrifice, of nature to theology, of natural right to conventional right. A State Temperance Meeting was asked to set its face against all use of alcoholic liquor as a drink, such use doing more than every thing else to drench all christendom in tears, if not indeed in blood also. But it failed to do so. Theology plead for its continued use at the Lord's Supper—for its continued use there, where the sacredness of the occasion makes the practice of the occasion a sacred and powerful example. Theology plead successfully, however silently. In a word, theology triumphed; and nature and temperance and truth went to the wall. The other instance to which I refer is connected with a libel suit. A very poor man in that County has for many years employed himself in writing books, hoping that he might in this wise both serve the cause of truth and add to his scanty means for supporting his very large and helpless family. Although all his books are on religion, and although he is not only a very learned but a very pure and pious man, an influential sectarian newspaper of the City of New York held an one of them, and in that one virtually all of them, as "composed entirely of balderdash and twaddle," and its author as "a renegade infidel." The reckless and atrocious libeller was prosecuted. But inasmuch as it was proved on the trial that the book, though written in the kind, candid, truth-loving, christian spirit of the author, is nevertheless at disagreement with some of the dogmas of the current theology, it was held that he was not entitled to a verdict. The law of natural justice, which the libelled had not at all, and which the libeller had grossly violated, called for a very heavy verdict. But as the law of theological and artificial justice was paramount with the jury, so the author, having studied to conform

his book to the claims of natural and real justice, was left to pay the costs of the suit. The doctrine prevailed that a man, in expressing his doubts of any of the dogmas in question, does thereby make himself an outlaw. You may with impunity, vilify and belie, to whatever extent you please, the books in which he expresses such doubts. Even more, as did the libeller in this case, hold up the books as marked with infamy, and you may, as did his eminent counsel help along the libel at this point by putting in open Court the cruelly offensive question to the libelled whether he did not think himself to be a lunatic. Nay, you may blacken the libelled with the worst epithets you can find in the dictionary. The shield of law is no longer over his head—but the condemnation of a theology. The trial in this case was nominally the trial of the libeller by the laws of the land, which are the laws of natural justice; but really it was the trial of the libelled by the laws of theology—laws which not only do not harmonize with, but are at utter war with, the laws of natural justice.

Oh, ye well-meaning but misled jurors, what a pity it is that when it was argued before you that it is no more than established usage to call the doubters of these dogmas "infidels" and "renegades", and no more than recognized liberty to call their writings "balderdash and twaddle"—what a pity it is that you had not been manly enough to resolve that you would do what you could by your verdict to put an end to such an absurd usage and to such a wicked liberty! Alas, that you too should, however undesignedly, have helped to dishearten this poor, tod-worn, goad and noble man, and to encourage this unjust and cruel man who was crushing him!

By the way, has it never occurred to you that the theologies are largely responsible for the currency and success which attend tale-bearing, slanders, libels and lies? Receiving a theology without proof (and all the popular theologies are destitute of proof,) prepares the way for receiving other things without proof. If in the important matter of embracing a theology, we can ignore the laws of evidence, how natural that we should make but too little account of them in interior matters! Why should I, wonder, when I hear that people believe I have been guilty of oppression here, and fraud there, and falsehood elsewhere? For that I have been guilty of all this, or that you have been guilty of the thousand things said against yourself, is not a millionth part as improbable as the fish story and some other theological stories, which people believe. As long as the theologies retain you and I must not wonder at the popular credulity in regard to any stories about ourselves or others, be they however big or however false. What the people of every land need is to be lifted up out of their superstitious credulity into a healthy skepticism—out of the habit of believing without adequate evidence into the habit of exacting such evidence. This better habit created, and they would laugh at the baseless theologies, and be as slow as they are now quick to open their ears to scandal.

I may be thought unfair for having spoken in the same connexion of the wrongs to which theology prompts in our day, and of those far greater ones of which Calvin and others were guilty in former days. But why is it that the theological wrongs of our day are less heinous? It is mainly because of that outside pressure and restraint upon the Church which has come of a more general enlightenment and of a higher civilization. Is it said that the Church has reformed herself? I answer that no moral reforms are to be looked for at the hands of the Church until she is rid of the incubus of the theologies. The theologies being the work of the past, necessarily keep the face of the Church toward the past. Her very life being in the past and in the preservation of the past, she is intensely conservative. Change is the dread of Protestantism as well as Catholicism; and will be the death of both.

The Church, in her branches which retain their theological stiffness, is as intolerant to-day as she ever was toward departures from her theology; and holds to as severe a punishment for them as she ever did. For instance, she still holds that doubts of the popular view of the Atonement or of the Divinity of Christ deserve a never-ending damnation. Formerly, when she had earthly sway, her own bloody hands would add to the punishment; would add punishment in this life to that in the life to come; would add a temporal hell to the eternal hell. I am willing to admit that now, when she has for so long a time lost the power to make this additions, she has quite naturally lost much of her disposition to make it. But the Pope's late Encyclical is only one of innumerable evidences that the disposition would revive with the power. The Pope, by the way, is the mouthpiece as well of Protestantism as of Catholicism. Both, it is true, are anxious to draw a line of separation between themselves. Nevertheless they are essentially one, and must continue to be, so long as they continue to be ruled by theologies which are essentially one.

What can prevent the recurrence of these theological wrongs? Nothing but the throwing away of the theologies. These wrongs, now greater, now less, restrained in one age and breaking through all restraints in another, are the necessary fruit of the theologies. Safe from these wrongs none will be, so long as men are held amenable to theologies. Safe, indeed, from no wrongs will men be, so long as they shall be judged by any other standard than reason and nature. The libelled man, in the case I have referred to, was judged by the theological standard; and was therefore sent forth to get along, as well as a heretic *without property* and with a *libel*-blasted reputation can get along in a theology-bound world. The Temperance Reformation too must do the best it can under the calamity of having theology stop the wheels of that beneficent and blessed Reformation at the very point where they should turn the swiftest. So also astronomers and geologists must lay their account with the disadvantage of having their discoveries come into collision with an infallible and inexorable theology.

But it will be asked—"What shall we do for religion if we throw away the theologies?" I answer that they never were religion, nor any part of it; and that they never stood in any other relation to it than that of its greatest hinderance and mightiest enemy. Were the theologies of the whole world cast aside, the religion of reason and nature would quickly bless the whole world. Were the historical and traditional religion cast aside, and were there in its place the religion of a present consciousness—the religion of the present voice of God to the soul and of the present voice of the soul to itself—men would not need to go from earth to find heaven.

I have often thought of your great change in these things. You were brought up in a strict Calvinistic theology. You have lost your theology, but your religion remains. God and His Spirit, and Jesus and prayer and the bible and the law of goodness and the hope of immortality are certainly no less dear to you than they were when you dwelt in your theological prison, and assumed that you *must* dwell in it all your days. But, though you have not lost your religion, there is, judging from my own experience, one thing you have lost. This one thing is the *certainty* of the objects of your faith. Once we could say with the orthodox: "I *know* whom I have believed," &c., "By two immutable things," &c. "We have also a more sure word of prophecy," &c. But now we find ourselves remitted to all the conscious uncertainty of human reasonings. Nevertheless, we would not, if we could, buy back this lost certainty. The price would be too great. It would be no less than ignoring the revelations of science and the laws of evidence, and turning our backs upon reason and nature, and again picking up and prizing the bundle of fictions and fancies and follies, which our convictions had compelled us to throw away.

For one, however great the comfort which may proceed from this certainty, I deny the right of any man to the comfort, because I deny the right of any man to the certainty. Such certainty is begotten of ignorance and superstition; and only the ignorant and superstitious have it. God does not give it to men. But He gives them powers in the constant exercise of which they may be constantly travelling toward such certainty. Instead of telling men what is truth, he leaves them to learn for themselves what is truth. Instead of treating them as

machines he treats them as free agents. The machine runs its round of necessity. The beaver and the bee do their work unerringly because instinctively and from the necessity of their nature. But man is left to choose his course and to reason out his duty and his destiny: and this implies the grandeur and responsibility of his nature, and his infinite superiority to the other orders of earthly creation.

That God makes these direct revelations, which theology claims He does, is contrary to all analogy. In order to know and supply the wants of the body and the brain we must be ever studying and toiling: and so must we to know and supply the wants of the soul.

Alas, that men should so generally cling to this cheap way of getting religious knowledge and advancing in the religious life! Alas that they should so generally believe that God has prepared to their hands what He has but given them hands to prepare for themselves!

These preachers of the assumed certainties of a religion of miracles and magic remind one of the quack doctors, who with their specifics and panaceas promise to cure the patient by a single dose. Empiricism is as much out of place in religious as in medical science.

I spoke of the loss of our certainty in regard to the objects of religious faith. And yet I am slow to believe that this entire certainty, which there are no reasons to justify, can afford as much comfort to its possessor as the measure of certainty which is built up on reasons. Moreover, might we not rightly expect that, if men would throw away the things, which have come down from the superstition of the ages to their own superstition—such as the remarkably accommodating disposition of the Sun and Moon toward a band of slaughterers, the transmutation of Mrs. Lot into a pillar of salt, and God's hating an unborn child—and would set themselves, in the exercise of their reason, to learn more and more of Him and of their relations to time and eternity—I say, might we not then rightly expect that they would thereby rapidly accumulate a fund of knowledge, which would fall but little, if any, short of absolute certainty? And, for our encouragement in this connection, we must remember that his dear Spirit that never works with superstition, does ever work with reason.

With great regard,

your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

GERRIT SMITH TO HORACE GREELEY.

A PLEA FOR THE SOUTH.

"CONSIDERING THYSELF, LEST THOU ALSO BE TEMPTED."

PETERBORO March 6th 1865.

Hon. HORACE GREELEY,

MY DEAR SIR,

I have not taken up my pen to defend the South. The extent of my present plea for her is simply to say, and briefly to illustrate, that there is one point at which she is little if any worse than the North—and this too, although it is right here that the North judges her most severely. The point to which I refer is weakness of national and patriotic feeling. Very remarkable, I admit, is this weakness in the South. Else she would not have fallen off from the nation: else her slaveholding and selfishness would not so easily have overcome her patriotism. But this weakness is perhaps no less at the North. If slaveholding and consequent love of rule can produce it at the South, so can greed of gain produce it at the North—and perhaps quite as abundantly.

New Jersey imposes a transit duty on the citizens and commerce of the other States; also on the mails; ay, and even on soldiers, who are pressing forward to shed their blood in defence of their country. My complaint is not chiefly because this transit duty violates the exclusive right of Congress to regulate commerce between the States, to establish post-roads, and to raise armies—the right to raise which, of course, implies the right to move them. Immeasurably more is my complaint because this transit duty violates those laws of neighborhood and fraternity, of intercourse and fellowship, which bind together the people of every worthy and happy nation. In effect, and to no small extent, New Jersey has seceded from the nation. That she has not seceded from it directly and entirely, is only because she has not been tempted to do so. With no affection for her sister States, and with no patriotism to make her national, she would not, unless obliged to, remain in the Union a single year after her selfish interests should begin to clamor for her withdrawal from it.

The State of New York is proving herself to be no less selfish, unpatriotic and unnational than the State of New Jersey. In two respects the Western States are unfavorably situated. 1st. They are so far from market as to make transportation very expensive. 2d. So bulky are their staples that the present highways are very far from sufficing for their transportation. Hence their last year's crop is still largely upon their hands. In these circumstances their call is loud, and increasingly loud, for more and cheaper outlets. For one of these outlets they look to the Niagara River. But the State of New York (if we call her Legislature herself) will not let them use this River—will not let it be improved and fitted for their use. By all that is patriotic and national, just and generous, fraternal and religious, she is urged to permit it. Nevertheless, she withstands the appeal. For she thinks she can make money by withstanding it; and it is money that she is after.

I do not complain of Congress for not authorizing this improvement of the Niagara River. Perhaps it is not a military necessity: and if it is not, I would not have Congress meddle with it. Congress can have no excuse for adding to the necessary burdens of war burdens which are not necessary.

I do not complain of Buffalo for opposing this improvement. I do not complain that her selfishness in opposing it seems to be as great as the selfishness of Oswego in advocating it. In weighing this great matter, the spirit, as well as the interest, of these towns is to be "counted as the small dust of the balance." By the way, Buffalo is blind, and Oswego may be sadly disappointed. Whatever shall contribute to draw the produce of the West to the foot of Lake Erie will be for the interest of Buffalo. The Niagara River would, with its proposed improvement, be lined with ship-yards—ship-yards for both Lake and Ocean vessels. Where could the materials for ship-building and for a vast variety of manufactures be more easily collected? These ship-yards and manufactures would be largely Buffalo's. The unequalled water-power created by this improvement would also be largely Buffalo's. From her commanding position, great population and great wealth, Buffalo would necessarily have the lion's share of that vast commerce, which would soon make the Niagara River and the foot of Lake Erie one of the busiest scenes of earth. Surely danger to Buffalo is not from routes which lead to her and by her. It can be only from such as lead elsewhere—as for instance, from present and projected routes through Canada, and from rivers, canals and railroads, that attract commerce from the region of the Lakes to Philadelphia, Baltimore and Western cities. As to Oswego, who hopes to share so largely in the increased commerce of Lake Ontario—she may be left to wonder that so much of it turns into Rochester and so much into Sodus, and that so much goes down to Ogdensburgh, to Montreal, to Portland and Quebec. In passing, let me say that one of the loudest objections to this improvement of the Niagara is made in the name of patriotism. The objection I refer to is that the improvement will divert Western produce from our own to foreign markets. But if this objection is well taken, then we have in it the very strongest commercial argument for the improvement. By all means let us have it, if it shall give to eight or ten of our Western States better markets in Montreal and Quebec than they now enjoy in Portland, Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore. For what, compared with the vital interests of these States, is the consideration that a few of our great cities will grow somewhat faster if they have the undivided trade of these States.

Away with all this narrowness! No man, who is the subject of it, is worthy of being called a statesman. Give to the West the best possible markets, be they within or without the nation. Would too that they could be given now, whilst she is suffering so much from the War, and whilst the commercial and manufacturing East is profiting so much from it!

I fear however that the improvement of the Niagara would not, to any considerable extent, give new and better markets, to the West. Probably, nearly all her commercial gains from it would be the cheapening of transportation to her old markets: and, by the way, this cheapening would be, not so much because the Niagara is the cheapest route, as because it would add another to the competitive routes. It is increased competition for the transportation of her products that the West needs.

I said that the objection in question is made in the name of patriotism. The objection, as well as the patriotism, is affected. Poor is that patriotism, which does not go for the country and the whole country. And as to the objection—they, who urge it, do not believe in it. They make little account—in my judgment less than

they should—of a river whose mouth is blocked up half the year with ice—It is interest in Buffalo and in the Western portion of the Erie Canal, that urges the objection.

It did not, it is not, of Congress nor of Buffalo that I complain. It is of our own State—a State that I long to see as wise and just, as generous and patriotic as she is rich and populous. A year ago, she refused to incorporate a company for making this necessary improvement in the Niagara. Would that she could now see it to be her duty to incorporate such a company! This, however, is hardly to be expected in the light of the fact that she has so recently planted herself squarely and effectually in the way not only of the Congressional but of every other authorization of the improvement. Had she but said that this is no time for the Government to incur a debt for such a work, I would not have censured her. But, as she said that the people of the Western States should not cross her territory except where she pleased and at what price she pleased, I hasten to condemn her. By the way, how stupid in two points of view is our State in dreading the Niagara River as a rival to her Erie Canal. 1st. It is her own River, leading down to her own Lake and its outlet; and therefore why should she dread it? 2d. The improvement of that River may be indispensable to save her from the fast multiplying rivals beyond her borders. Instead of being wisely afraid of others, she is foolishly afraid of herself. Or rather, she refuses to adopt another means of defence against foreign rivalry lest it may prove more effective than her present means. A very silly nation would be that, which should refuse to build a new fort, lest it might do more execution than the old one.

And then how ridiculously conceited is our State in assuming that her present avenues for Western commerce are superior to all possible avenues for it out of the State! It may turn out that, even if we shall avail ourselves of our greatest natural advantages for attracting that commerce, we shall nevertheless fail to enjoy any very large portion of it. There are far shorter routes North of us; and the routes South of us, not to speak of their other advantages, are favored with a climate far less rigorous than our own. In fine, it may turn out, not that the improvement of the Niagara River is indispensable to save to Buffalo and the State of New York a large share of Western commerce, but that, even with this improvement and every other possible improvement to that end, the most of it will go elsewhere. When was there ever greater stupidity, or greater conceit than that which our State is now illustrating? She is virtually boasting that, with one hand tied, she can still whip the world. But she may yet see that if she had as many hands as Briarous, she would nevertheless need them all to reach successfully after the bulk of Western commerce. Utterly contemptuous of all commercial rivalry is she. Utterly contemptuous, in this respect, is she of Boston and Philadelphia; and of Baltimore too, who, now that she is relieved of the incubus of slavery, is to be no mean competitor for the trade of the West. Of the St. Lawrence she makes no more account than does Behemoth of a river. "Behold, he drinketh up a river, and hasteth not." And as to little Mississippi, it is but enough to rinse her mouth with, as Jordan was but enough for the like service to Behemoth. "He trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth." She allows her present commercial pre-eminence to assure her of her future commercial pre-eminence. Certain is she that: "To-morrow shall be as this day and much more abundant."

Poor State of New York! She is shriveled by her petty policy; and this petty policy has come of her vanity and greed. Tell her that the improvement of the Niagara will add to the business of her canals and railroads and rivers and towns; and she will straightway answer you—that her tolls in this or that section may be diminished by it. She is after tolls instead of commerce. In her folly she makes tolls the primary and commerce the secondary consideration. She "holds at the spigot whilst it runs at the bung."

Alas, our States! No wonder they have fallen asunder. Slavery and avarice have done their work upon them. Instead of loving each other, and working together to build up the noblest nation on the earth, they, like the States of thereby ruined ancient Greece, are jealous of each other, and hate each other, and work against each other. Seeing that our nation is composed of such selfish and mutually warring elements, what better can we expect for her than a short and unhappy existence?

The doubt is sometimes expressed whether we Yankees are capable of becoming christians. The reason for the doubt is that our individuality is so intense—or, in less flattering phrase, that we are so intensely selfish, and so prone to pull and haul each to his own side and to his own interest. For the like reason may it not be doubted whether we Yankees are capable of becoming a prosperous and permanent nation?

New Jersey a christian State! New York a christian State! Say not so! To be a christian is to fall in with Christ's God. But who is so foolish as to believe that Christ's God sees with complacency New Jersey and New York so greedy of gain, as to throw themselves across the pathway of His children, and demand a fee for allowing them commercial and fraternal intercourse? Does Christ's God refuse His Niagara River to His children in the Western States? Oh no! He made it for them more than for His children in this State—because they need it more.

And say not that New Jersey and New York are patriotic and national States. They are breaking up our nation—and this too under an infinitely feebler temptation than that which the Southern States yielded to when they broke off from it. The time is past for saying to either New Jersey or New York: "Considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." They have both been tempted, and they have both fallen. And so long as they continue to deny to their sister States the right of way—a right as clear, certain and natural as the right to breathe—so long will the man, who judges States by their dispositions as well as their deeds, class New Jersey and New York with South Carolina and the other Rebel States.

Surely, surely, if the day shall ever come when a sounder patriotism and a juster understanding of commercial interests shall obtain in the State of New York, it will not then be held to have been an honor to belong to her Legislatures, which refused the people of the Western States a cheaper route across her territory.

I said that we must not call New Jersey and New York christian States. Christ's religion bids us extend good not only to Sister States, but it bids us "go into all the world" with the good—even down the St. Lawrence.

What must we poor Yankees do? We cannot adopt Auguste Comte's Positive Religion—for that expressly requires us to live "*pour autrui*"—for others—for "family, country, humanity." We cannot adopt that Religion—for we insist on self-seeking as our practical rule. Nor, though we loudly profess it, can we really adopt Christianity. For this Religion not only requires us to live for all mankind, but for their Maker also. Are we fated then to be nothing better than self-seeking atheists?

With great regard

your friend

GERRIT SMITH

SERMON IN PETERBORO

MAY 21 1865.

21

THE NATION STILL UNSAVED.
ONLY REPENTANCE CAN SAVE IT.

"*Think ye that they were sinners above all men? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.*" LUKE XIII: 4, 5.

Jesus tenght the hy-standers on this occasion, thet there wes one thing more important for them to do than to be concerning themselves with the qnestion whether certain persons were the greatest of all sinners. This one thing was to repent.

However important it mey he for the North to he impressing herself with the great wickedness of those who are pre-eminently responsible for this war and for the sturving and murdering of tens of thousands of prisoners, her mere important duty nevertheless is to repent of her own sins.

Why is repentance the paramount duty?—the indispenschle exercise? Becouse, in the first place, that we mey therehy be enabled to judge ourselves justly: and hecause, in the second place, thet we may therehy be enabled to judge others justly. The impenitent man, not only flatters and deceives himself, but, where tempted to it, he is uncharitable and unjnst in his judgments of others. He is blind, not only to the wrongs in himself, but to whatever mitigates the wrongs of which others are guilty. Oftentimes he is in haste to punish others for crimes, which are far smaller than his own. David, though in his impenitence stone-blind to his crime of murder and to the scarcely less crime it was to cover, was nevertheless eager for the killing of a man who had killed but a lamh.

That the North has not repented is manifest in ten thousand ways. Even of her cruel and crnshing, infamons and infernal treatment of her colored hrethren, in all the past, she does not repent. In this Rebellion they have been the saviors of the nation. Nevertheless, the North does not even yet show herself willing to recognize the rights of their manhood. Much reason is there to fear that she will allow the revolting States to he reconstructed on the principle that the black man is still to he left in the hands of the white man—of him who has ever been his enemy. Indeed, it still looks as if, in these States, disloyal men, if only they are white, will he counted worthier of the ballot than loyal men who are black. Politicians and presses are arguing that each of these States will heve the Constitutional right to determine for herself who shall vote. For entirely do they ignore the fact that those States have lost every Constitutional right; and that it rests solely with their conquerors to say who in them shall or shall not he allowed to vote.

But in nothing does the North prove her lack of repentance more than in her clamor for the punishment of rebel leaders. For surely were she surveying herself penitently, she would have no heart to punish offences, which are substantially her own also; or which, to say the least, have sprung from doctrines and deeds of which she, as well as the South, has been partaker.

How unseemly, not to say how intensely hypocritical, for the North to punish the South for holding the doctrine of Secession, when those eminent advocates of it, Jefferson and Madison, have ever been as high political authorities at the North as at the South!—and when tee the doctrine had become so popular at the North, that some of her national Conventions indorsed it! And how unseemly, not to say how intensely hypocritical, for the North to punish the South for putting the doctrine in practice! For what impelled the South to do so but the spirit of slavory?—that spirit for the generating and festering of which the North is scarcely less responsible than the South? Nay, in the light of her smaller and less direct temptation, she is far more wickedly responsible for that spirit. The religion, politics, commerce and social usages of the North have all been shaped to the interests and biddings of slavery. And, as to the Southern type of the proslavery spirit being worse than the Northern, a sufficient answer is that the Northern was had enough to mob and murder innocent abolitionists through the space of nearly thirty years. Let me add, however, thet this spirit never made, North nor South, a more abhorrent exhibition of itself than in hanging and burning negroes in New York, not yet two yeers ago. That the North admits that the nation has ever been held hy her organic law to defend slavery (and this she admits in her present attempt to amend and reverse the law at this point,) is her virtual admission that she has ever been morally disqualified to punish the South for slavery. But to punish the South for the Rebellion is to punish her for slavery. The North presuming to judge the South, when it is certainly not for her to deny that she authorized the wickedness of the South! Better for her to confess with Shakespeare, that,

"Thieves for their robbery have authority
When judges steal themselves."

The North presuming to judge and condemn the South! It is adulterous Angelo condemning adulterous Claudio.

No, the North, were she penitent, would instantly recoil from the proposition to punish the South. For she would see, in the light of such facts as I have glanced at, her partnership with the South in the political fallacies and moral wrongs, which have brought this great sorrow upon the land. Were she penitent, she would, because seeing her own large share of the guilt of it, acknowledge the Rebellion to be the work of the North as well as of the South. Even the starving and murdering of prisoners—that crime of crimes, which the spirit of slavery is alone capable of—she would, were she penitent, acknowledge a joint Northern and Southern responsibility for, because she would see the spirit of slavery to be the product of the North as well as of the South.

The North, were she penitent, would spurn every suggestion and every temptation to violate her agreement to conduct the War according to the law of war. That agreement stands in spite of our General Order No. 100, issued years after the agreement, and when our intoxicating prospect of success prompted us to take

high rather than tenable ground. No Order of one of the parties could modify the agreement of both the parties. It takes two to break as well as two to make a bargain. Again, Section 154 in that Order refers to precedents for punishing "leaders of a *rebellion*"—whereas, in strictness, it is not a rebellion, but a civil war with which our country is afflicted. Moreover, in the light of the teachings of the publicists, it is such a civil war as is pre-eminently entitled to come under "the common laws of war," and to be conducted "in every respect as a public war between two different nations." No more legal right have we to punish the subdued foe in this case than we would have were the Mexicans that foe. And when we consider that we are largely responsible for the pro-slavery spirit and political education, that incited our countrymen to take up arms against us, we are infinitely further from having a moral right to punish them than we should be were they foreign enemies. I add that if the learned Dr. Lieber* did write this Order, he is nevertheless not authorized to say that its Section 154 is to be interpreted into a declaration that the Government will punish for treason its enemies in this war. The Section is, at the most, but a hint to this end. And even this is unworthy of a faith-keeping and honorable Government. Ay, and if the hint had the effect to provoke the rebels to acts unauthorized by the law of war, then have we to blame ourselves, as well as them, for such acts.

Let me here say, that the law of war is not to be construed as sanctioning any thing beyond the scope of its principles, or in obvious conflict with its established practices. Hence those individuals, upon whom can be fastened, definitely and certainly, the authorship and responsibility of this monstrous crime against prisoners, can no more be screened from punishment by this law than can those, who had a part in the assassination of our beloved President.

Were the North penitent, she would claim from the South no indemnity for the past—since she would see herself to be disentitled to it by her community of guilt with the South. All she would claim would be security for the future—and this security not for herself only, but for the South also. Nor would she claim to this end any thing not absolutely necessary—probably nothing more, in addition to her duty to all the loyal, than the disfranchisement of the disloyal and the parcelling out to the poor of the South, black and white, her large landed estates.

If ever there was a case where both parties should consent that by-gones be by-gones, it is this case of the North and the South. They equally need to be forgiven by each other, and they equally need to seek the forgiveness of God. The policy of intimidation must be abandoned. The Southern people have given abundant proof that they cannot be intimidated. And if they could be, it is not what is wanted. Love is the look. That is the power (and even statesmen will yet learn it,) which God made men to be swayed by. The love of the North for the South would quickly beget a returning love. The North, leading the way to repentance, would quickly be followed by the South. For it is as true that repentance leads to repentance as that "the goodness of God leadeth" to it. This is a matter in which man as well as God is capable of an effective lead. Only let the North be as much concerned to love the South as a certain class of politicians and a certain class of priests are to have her punish the South, and all will be well. Then, with the best of all the world's forms of national government, with the ever-threatening and ever-disuniting doctrine of state-sovereignty buried forever, with no more slavery to corrupt and barbarize; and with the vast tides of Northern immigration warmly welcomed by the South and making her homogeneous with the North, our nation will soon become the best and the happiest of all nations.

The question, however, that should press us, is not whether our nation shall attain this pre-eminence, but whether it shall so much as be saved. In other words, will it repent? For as Jesus teaches, and as is manifest in the nature of things, repentance is the condition of salvation. It is so, no less in the case of a nation than of an individual. Impenitence ruins. Penitence restores from the ruin. Impenitence carries its subject away from himself. "The prodigal son" came to himself when he came to be penitent. From the first, I have scarcely doubted that the Rebellion would be crushed. But I must confess that, from the first, I have not seen sufficient evidence that the nation would be saved. For, from the first, I have seen but few signs of her repentance. Even to-day, my hope that she will be saved is not a confident one. Two things inspire my strong fear that she will not be. 1st. The North, although guilty with the South of this Rebellion, is nevertheless, so impenitent and so hypocritical, as to call for the punishment of the conquered South. 2d. Notwithstanding it was because of her spirit of caste and contempt of race that God let this awful war come upon her, nevertheless so far is she from repenting at this point, as to be invoking the satanic spirit and the satanic contempt against the right of the black man to vote. The North flatters herself that, in calling for punishment, she is moved, not by vengeance, but by a sense of justice. Were justice however her aim, her absorbing concern would be to lift up the down-trodden black man into the enjoyment of all political rights.

Because, like Gov. Seward, I prophesied that this War would be a very short one, so my prophecy, should I ever make it, that this nation will, for the reasons I have hinted at, be lost, might be very little heeded. And yet the cause for the failure of the former prophecy would go far to justify the making of the other. Why was it that, when slavery made war upon the nation, she failed to end the war, without delay? Simply because she had not (though I was simple enough to suppose she had) the wisdom and the courage to put slavery down, without delay. Her failure to end at that time both slavery and the war contributes to justify the apprehension that she will now fail to save the country. Her corruptions from slavery made her helpless then. These corruptions continue, and threaten to make her helpless now.

I am not, however, amongst the unlikeliest of prophets. I may be laughed at for my prophecy in regard to the length of the War. But I shall never more be laughed at, (though I was then,) for going through the country, nearly a quarter of a century ago, with the prophecy that the nation would be ruined unless the ministers took to "preaching politics"—to inculcating upon their hearers their political duties to the slave. I shall never more be laughed at, (though I was then,) for declaring every where—in Congress, as well as out of Congress—that there would be "blood even unto the horse bridles," unless slavery were speedily put away. And I shall never more be laughed at, (though I was then,) for making it my text, in the very first year of this War, that: "which ever party gets the right gets the victory." Indeed, if I shall ever set myself up as a prophet, I shall have no little capital to start with.

To be serious, however—and perhaps as egotistical as serious—it would not be strange if an old abolitionist, who has made slavery his life study, should have a somewhat more than common foresight of the workings of slavery. Especially dull must he be, if he have not.

As you are aware, I but seldom preach. I had to preach for the slave a quarter of a century ago, because so few of the ministers would consent to preach for him. I had to preach for him out of doors and in groves

* See N. Y. Independent of 18th instant.

because they, who had charge of the Churches, would not let them be put to so unpopular, so despised, and so hated a use. Perhaps, I owe an apology for preaching now. My apology—the same in the present as in the former instance—is the necessity of the case. Few of the ministers are preaching for such a termination of this War, as the principles and spirit of Christ call for. Many of them are leaping over Christ and the New Testament to ransack the barbaric Jewish Theology for texts most responsive and grateful to their blood-thirstiness. Some of them shock us by the levity with which they speak of the hanging of the rebels. Others by their vulgar and malignant shouting of: "Hang them! hang them high as Haman!" All over the land, this cruel and Christless Theology is calling on the Government to shed blood. God grant that it shall prove itself too wise and too just to listen to the call. To drag out from under the law of war, and to punish for treason under the Constitution, even so much as a single individual of the many millions with whom we agreed that this War should be conducted by the law of war, would be a stupendous breach of faith never to be forgotten, and therefore never ceasing to disgrace us. It would be a long backward step in civilization and a shameful ignoring of the principles and spirit of christianity. Moreover, no one thing could do more to hinder the salvation of the country.

I do not forget how often it is urged that England, who claims to be foremost of all the nations in christianity and civilization, punished the leaders in the late Irish Rebellion. It is true that she did so. But, in the first place, that Rebellion did not reach the point where it would have come under the international code of war. The rebels did not rise from traitors into "enemies." In the second place, though law would have justified great severity, she punished but few of the rebels, and even these with moderation. In the third place, although we honor and thank England and other nations for what is wise and humane in their example, we nevertheless hold that America should be above graduating her own moralities and policies by those of even the most enlightened European nations. They began their existence, and gave shape to their institutions, in ages of darkness. But she was moulded in an age of light. A higher wisdom therefore than that, which they have been in circumstances to reach, must govern her. To a justice far higher than their conventional and defective justice must she aspire:—yes, even to absolute justice—to the heaven-inspired, the Christ-illustrated justice. Would God, we were up there now! Then should we, instead of disdaining the highest positions of liberality and mercy, in the most authoritative writings on the law of war, make it the blessedness and glory of our country to outdo even those highest positions. Then should we end this War in such a Christ-spirit and Christ-love toward enemies, as would make it difficult for the nations, under the winning light of our example, to end their wars otherwise;—nay, as would make it difficult for either them or us to *begin* any more wars.

I referred to the injustice and hypocrisy of the North in clamoring for punishment. There is nothing in this connection in which she appears worse than in her endeavors by the pulpit and the press, by popular meetings and by visiting committees, to fire the President with vengeance. How she repeats, and gloats over, his admission that treason is a crime to be punished! No one denies that treason is a crime—a great crime—and that, as a general proposition, it should be punished—severely punished. But in this case there is no treason to punish. I do not say that there is no moral treason in this case. Of this there is an abundance. What I say is, that there is no treason in the eye of law. When the Rebellion broke out, all the Rebels were traitors; and we had the legal right to punish them as such. But, however slowly and reluctantly, we nevertheless became, at last, convinced that we could not carry on the contest and save our country, unless we allowed these rebels to come up from traitors in a Rebellion into enemies in a Civil War—and a Civil War too differing in respect to none of its rights from a war with a foreign nation.

I have here given the reason why we have no treason to punish. But how enforced is this reason by the consideration that the North is little if any less guilty of the causes of the Rebellion than is the South!

And then to urge *President Johnson* to punish the Rebels!—to urge *him* to punish Pro-Slavery! What stupendous hypocrisy is this urging him to be guilty of! Who is he, that he should punish men for deeds they were hurried into in their Pro-Slavery blindness, when he himself was, until so recently, a partaker of that blindness. On one occasion and another, he advocated the most extreme Pro-Slavery measures!—and he even went so far as to vote for Breckenridge for President!! God be praised, that the noble man had the good sense and the patriotism, which enabled him to resist the Pro-Slavery education and Pro-Slavery pressure, that his neighbors could not resist! But it is not for him to punish them. God be praised, that his eyes were opened to the true character of Slavery! Nevertheless, it is not for him to punish those, who did not get theirs open to it as soon as he did. Sublimely said our beloved Lincoln—"If the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an Executive duty to re-enslave such persons (persons freed by the Emancipation Proclamation,) another, and not I, must be the instrument to perform it." As sublime would President Johnson be in saying, that, if the American people will be guilty of the inconsistency and hypocrisy of punishing for the deeds and results of Slavery, they must choose another, instead of himself, to execute their will. Will he not say it? God will help him say it. The President will be content to let the black Pro-Slavery past of both the North and the South go unpunished by him. He will feel that it has already been too severely punished. Security for a bright Anti-Slavery future is all that he will claim.

LETTER TO CHIEF JUSTICE CHASE.

Penancone May 28th 1866.

CHIEF JUSTICE CHASE,

My dear Sir,

I see that Jefferson Davis is to be brought before you for trial. believe you have not the right to try him; and I hope you will hold you have not.

Your Court administers the Constitution—not the law of war. But neither Jefferson Davis nor any of is fellow revolutionists are under the Constitution: nor have they been, since the contest they embarked in became a civil war. They are under the law of war—under the law of the conqueror—as exclusively as would e Mexico, were it she, instead of the South, that we have conquered. In saying *exclusively*, I do not forget that ir Governmental action is to the contrary. But this hybrid action—this weak and cowardly vacillation be-ween the Constitution and the law of war—this dealing with the South, now under the one and now under the ther—proves nothing but its own absurdity. The South, if Peace between her and the North is restored, is gain under the Constitution. If it is not restored (and her non-representation in Congress and our troops in he midst of her are amongst the things which prove it is not,) then is she still under the law of war. Under his law let her be punished for her violations of this law—be it for starving our prisoners, for assassinating our resident, or for slaughtering on the battle-field our surrendered prisoners. Under this law, if they participated any of these crimes, let even her Davises and Stephenses and Lees be tried: and, I add, that for no offence hatever should they be tried by any other than a military court.

But why do I put the South on the footing of a conquered nation? I do so, 1st, Because, in the light of he teachings of the wisest and most advanced publicists, she is on it; 2d, Because our Government is committ-d by its own acts during the war to regard the South as on this footing; and 3d, Because of the abundant nd conclusive reasons there are why these publicists should have taught as they did, and why our Government ould have acted as it did.

1st. A few citations will show that I have not mistaken these teachings. Vattel says:

"But when a nation becomes divided into two parties absolutely independent, and no longer acknowledging a common superior, e state is dissolved, and the war between the two stands on the same ground, in every respect, as a public war between two different tions. They decide their quarrel by arms, as two different nations would do. The obligation to observe the common laws of war wards each other is therefore absolute—indispensably binding on both parties, and the same which the law of nations imposes on all-tions in transactions between state and state."

As precisely our case is this as if Vattel had had us, and us only, in his mind.

Hallam, Macaulay, Wolcker, unsurpassed authorities on such subjects, and all of our own enlightened y, fully sustain Vattel. In speaking of civil war, Hallam says:

"The vanquished are to be judged by the rules of nations, not of municipal law."

Macaulay says that, in such case,

"The vanquished ought to be treated according to the rules not of municipal but of international law."

And Wolcker says:

"His (the leader's) followers are also more or less punishable as aiders and abettors, as long as their number has not grown so ge that a sincere belief exists that he or they act with the consent of the nation, or that a division of the nation has taken place into o hostile camps. In the latter case the rebellion becomes civil war: the right has become doubtful and is left, as in the wars between veral states, to the decision of an Almighty judgment. (*Gottesgericht.*) Under such a presumption every citizen is bound to declare mself for one or the other party (according to the wise law of Solon he is bound to do it—to go either right or left;) and then neither ime nor punishment can reach him, whatever the result of the battle may be. Then there are only Victors and Vanquished—not Loy-sts and Criminals. And although it is difficult to state the precise moment when Rebellion ceases and Civil War commences, there rertheless exists an essential difference between them, and when the moment has arrived, it is then for the victorious party to extend mency, and even no punishment at all—for prudence and humanity would dictate such a course."

In the Article "Treason" in the New American Cyclopedia, said to be written by our eminent fellow tizen, Dr. Lieber, are the following lines:

"No one incurs the guilt of treason by an adherence to a king or Government *de facto*, although the king or Government has but e right of a successful rebel, and loses all by a subsequent defeat."

2d, That our Government is committed by its own acts to deal with the South as with a conquered nation manifest in the light of the character of those acts. It followed other nations and recognized the belligerent ghts of the South—its Supreme Court unanimously recognizing them. It blockaded her ports. It exchanged soners with her. It negotiated with her for Peace—and in one of these negociations our Commissioners, who ut more than half way to meet hers, were no less than the President and the Secretary of State. In a word, came into a clear understanding with the enemy, that the War should be conducted according to the law war.

I do not forget that our Order No. 100 in 1863 is quoted to prove that we therein apprized the enemy at, if finally vanquished, he would be held for treason. Nor do I forget that President Lincoln's Proclamation Amnesty implied that the case was still one of treason. But these were, all *ex parte* as well as *ex post facto* pers; and had, therefore, no power to repeal, nor in any wise modify, the understanding between the ies—most emphatically not, whilst the parties were continuing to act upon that understanding. The same true of any Act of Congress touching the case. And, just here, let me say that, since there was no treason pardon, President Johnson had no pardoning to do. Pardons to Southern men are no more in place than uld he pardons to Englishmen had we conquered England.

3d. I will advert to a few of the abundant and conclusive reasons, which justify these eminent writers on blic law in taking the ground in question, and which, therefore, justify our Government in having virtually en it.

A mere insurrection or rebellion is to be put down by municipal or local law. But when the strife rises into the dimensions and dignity of a civil war, the belligerents are too numerous to be held as traitors. Says Edmund Burke: "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." Nor is the objection to treating them as traitors, instead of enemies in war, overcome by pardoning all but a few. The stigma of treason should not come upon any of them: and the pardon but fastens it, instead of wiping it off. By the way, the spirit of Republican institutions utterly forbids this distinction between the many and the few—this holding of only the prominent few responsible, and reducing the many to mere cyphers. They, who chose Davis and Stephens for office, were as responsible for their choice as were Davis and Stephens for submitting to it. As reasonable would it be to punish the chosen in the choosers as the choosers in the chosen. If we punish Davis and Stephens, consistency requires us to punish thousands: and, if we let the thousands go unpunished, consistency requires us to let Davis and Stephens go unpunished.

B. When vast numbers take a very important step, it is not only reasonable to believe that they think they have much ground for it, but it is also reasonable to believe that they really have some ground for it. And in this connexion let me add, that if Government is entirely just toward all its subjects, it is hardly supposable that any considerable share of them will ever be found arrayed against it. That Revolutions occur is to be ascribed mainly, and well nigh universally, to the injustice of Government. Especially ready should be Republicans who, by force of their institutions and education, honor numbers instead of worshipping the few, to blame Government rather than the people. Especially ready should they be to view with charity a however great wrong, where it is a whole people, who are driven into it.

C. Civil wars, unless they shall be allowed to be conducted in their final as well as in all their stages by the law of war, will, ere long, become "block flag" and "no quarter" wars. And in this place let me say that we should have lost our country had not our Government consented to let the War be conducted according to the law of war. The North would rather have given up the South than have tried to hold her by a war carried on upon the low plane of a merciless barbarism.

D. There is suffering enough in a civil war, and especially to the defeated party, without adding to it after the fighting has ceased. And surely, surely, the spirit of the man, who, to increase the suffering of the South, would break the agreement with her to carry on the War under the law of war, is not to be envied.

I need give no more reasons in support of the authorities I cited. But it will be said that the Constitution plainly defines what is treason; and that your Court must follow the Constitution. I admit the plainness of the definition. But, certainly, I must not admit that every one, who does what in another would be treason, is himself guilty of it. A French or English army invades us. The Constitutional definition of treason describes the acts of this Army. We capture it. Nevertheless we do not try it for treason. Why not? Simply, because it is of another nation. But the South came up into a *de facto* nation—for the time being into another nation—and, therefore, we should not try her for treason.

I have admitted the plainness of the Constitution at one point. Its lack of plainness at another and most vital point is of itself a sufficient reason why the South should not be held for treason. It was not slavery alone, but slavery combined with the doctrine of State sovereignty, that brought on the War. Since no small share of the statesmen of the North and a large majority of the statesmen of the South, including even Jefferson and Madison, have believed that they saw this doctrine in the Constitution, it is idle to say that adequate pains were taken to shut it and all semblance of it out of the Constitution. Perhaps, the streams of blood shed in this horrid War have not washed away, entirely and forever, this pernicious doctrine. Then, let it be provided for, if not in a Constitutional Amendment, at least in the terms of "Reconstruction," that it shall no more return to curse us. And, at any rate, let none be punished for acting upon this doctrine, until it shall have been made indisputably certain to every reasonable mind that the doctrine is not a part of the law of the land.

I need say no more to show that it was a civil war in which the South became involved—and such a civil war, as brought her emphatically under the law of war. I need say no more to show that she can never come within the jurisdiction of your Court until the Peace-making power shall have restored the former sway of the Constitution. But for the sudden collapse and annihilation of the Confederacy, the President and Senate would have been on our part this Peace-making power. Now, the law-making power of the Constitution is the whole of this Peace-making power.

How great would be the sorrow of all the oppressed nations of Christendom, at learning that the Chief Justice of the United States holds that in a civil war, and even in a fully developed one, there remains the crime of treason and work for the executioner! They would feel fresh alarm, whilst every despot would feel himself more firmly seated than ever. Surely, America, with all her boasted love of freedom and human rights and with all her deference for numbers, should not be guilty of subjecting the vanquished party in a civil war to the law of treason. There will probably be many more civil wars. The great majority of them will originate in the interests of Freedom. Some of them—perhaps many of them—will result adversely to her. When they do, shall the conquering tyrants be able to plead the example of America—of Republican America—of Freedom-loving America—for hanging the vanquished Washingtons and Franklins? God forbid! But it will be claimed that the Washingtons and Franklins, having a just cause, should not be hung; and that the Devises and Lees should be, because their cause is unjust. Unavailing distinction! For the conqueror would have but to hold (and for this his own bare word would be his sufficient authority,) that his own cause is just and the enemy's unjust—and then his way would be clear to go straight to hanging the Washingtons and Franklins.

On the other hand, there is not in all Christendom one enlightened friend of human rights, who would not rejoice in the influence on the cause of human rights of your refusing to recognize the crime of treason in a popular rising, after it has reached the stage of civil war. For there is not one such, who would fail to see in the refusal a proper respect and deference to numbers; or who would fail to see in it the making of Revolution more easy; and, what is far better, the making of Governments more studious of justice in order to prevent Revolution. By the way, there are some, who deny the right of Revolution in a Republic—especially in a Republic, where suffrage is as extended as in our own; and hence do they deny that the Revolutionists in a Republic are entitled to the humanities of the law of war. But there may be as unendurable oppressions in a Republic (there have been in our own), as under monarchy or oligarchy. It is not where the oppression is, but how great it is, which affects the question of the right of Revolution.

Humanity is, on the whole, constantly making progress. In almost every age it takes some marked and wide step upward and onward. Such a one will it take in this age, if Christendom shall declare herself against the recognition of treason in a civil war. Will she thus declare herself? A mighty impulse toward it would she feel from your inviting her to declare it. "And who knoweth," my old and honored and beloved friend,

"whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" Beautiful and glorious for yourself, your country and mankind will be your Chiefjusticeship, if God shall incline you thus to illustrate it. And not a little would be done toward gaining us the heart of the South, should you from your high place say that she ought not to be put on trial for treason For to try Jefferson Davis for it would be to try herself for it: and a wrong to him would be felt by each of her aggrieved people to be a wrong to himself.

How sad that the North should in this, the great trial-hour of her wisdom and integrity, be found so mistaken in regard to her needs and duties! She denounces the South for bringing on the War. But her own responsibility for it is no less than that of the South. Nay, in the light of the fact that her temptations to betray Freedom and Justice were so much weaker than those which assailed the South, her share of the common responsibility for the War is far the greater. She clamors for the punishment of the South under the Constitution. But she should feel that the South has been punished very severely already. She complains that the South has still a hard heart. But it is not harder than her own. The heart, that can refuse gratitude to the brave, forgiving and magnanimous black saviors of our country, and that, by denying them suffrage, can throw them again under the feet of their old oppressors, is a heart that need not look abroad for a worse one. The North calls on the South to repent. But she needs to humble herself by the side of the South in a common repentance for common sins.

The North has desolated and estranged the South. Whether all this was or was not necessary, it is nevertheless clear that her present work is to win and comfort and bless the South. Great as is this work, it can, however, be done. It is true, that the President has by his unwise policy, sadly demoralized the South. For that policy, by the way, he is not to be severely judged. It grew almost necessarily out of his unavoidable pro-slavery education. It is true that, though he found the South humiliated and sober, and in a state to respond to the claims of truth and reason, he has, by the pernicious expectations which he has excited in her, turned her quite away from listening to those claims, and turned her quite back again into her old habits of arrogance and tyranny. Nevertheless, Congress could have recovered her, by promptly announcing its unalterable policy of impartial justice to all her classes. Then would the South have respected Congress. Now she despises it. Then would Congress have converted the South. Now the South is converting Congress. No "Civil Rights Law", and no other substitute for entire justice, can save the South. No promise of protection to that portion of her people, whom it leaves stripped of their own power and natural right to protect themselves, can save her. Without equal justice in all things to all her people, she will go straight on to greater horrors than those she has emerged from—even to the horrors of a war of races. The absurd position of the President and of one Member of the Cabinet after another, and of one Member of Congress after another, that the conqueror, though acknowledged to have the entire control of every thing else in the conquered States, has only a partial control of suffrage in them, will not suffice to cheat the blacks of the South, and least of all, their Great Avenger.

I have said that we must deal with the South in the spirit of impartial justice. We must also deal with her in the spirit of great generosity and great love. We must claim no indemnity for the past. We must exact no unnecessary security for the future. We must subject her to no changes and no disabilities, which are not indispensable. If the breaking up of her large landed estates to parcel them out to her white and black poor is not demanded by her people, we must not insist upon it. If, by putting the ballot in the hands of her blacks, it will not be necessary, in order to save her, to withhold it for a season from her whites who were involved in the guilt of the War, then are there strong reasons why we should not insist upon the probation. One thing more. The South is poor, and the North is still rich. Would it be too large an expression of fraternal love to save the South for some five or ten years from the imposition of direct national taxes?

With great regard

your friend

GERRIT SMITH.

Smith?

JUGGLERY.

Jugglers have always abounded in all parts of the world. Some of them juggle by sleight of hand: some by cunning speech: some in one way, and some in another. From what we see of them in our own country, demagogues are always jugglers.

Much is it to be regretted that the President of the United States gives his countenance to this demagogical class of jugglers. His doing so is unworthy of his high office, of his bright intellect, and of his brave and patriotic bearing during the War. Let these fellows juggle with their artful phrases about the Constitution and the Union. Let them busy themselves in attracting to their idols the superstitious worship of the cheated people. The President, however, instead of favoring such base work, should frown upon it. He should not lift a finger toward maintaining in the popular heart this blind and boundless regard for the Constitution and the Union, which these jugglers have succeeded in creating there. He knows that, notwithstanding the great respect due to the fathers, who gave us the Constitution and the Union, they were fallible men, and did their work imperfectly. Every generation should be more enlightened than the previous one; and should be at entire liberty to shape the Constitution and the Union to the demands of its own wisdom and its own wants. And the President, surely, ought to know that the object of these jugglers in getting the Constitution and Union worshipped is not the patriotic one of honoring and maintaining the Constitution and Union, but the unprincipled one of carrying such constructions, as their selfish interests may put upon them.

The most melancholy instance of this use of "Constitution" and "Union" to conjure with, was in the case of slavery. These conjurers or jugglers, having persuaded the people that the chief end of the Constitution and Union was to enable the white men to tread out the life-blood of the black men, could easily counteract an agitation for the abolition of slavery by lifting up their cries for the claims and safety of the endangered Constitution and Union. It was in this wise mainly, that the people were restrained from sweeping away slavery.

In his late Message, the President strikingly betrays the influence of the jugglers upon himself. He there takes the ground that "the Union is not only undissolved but indissoluble." In point of fact, it is both dissoluble and dissolved. Facts break through theories; and, in spite of any theory to the contrary, the Union is, whether rightly or wrongly, actually dissolved. And then too, the Union cannot, in the nature of things, be absolutely indissoluble. Not even the Constitution claims that it is. The most that can be said in this respect is that the Union should never be dissolved but for adequate cause. The South, if unendurably oppressed in the Union, had the right to break away from it. The North is bringing her back: and, as her conqueror, has the right to dictate the terms upon which she shall come back. May these terms be so reasonable and so affectionate, that the South will never desire to break away again! In further illustration of the dissolubleness of the Union,—it is possible that Texas, in spite of her good German population, and that Maine, in spite of her "Maine Law," may, in a generation or two, become so incorrigibly base, as to justify the other States in shutting them out of the Union. Or, to frame a supposition, that is more complimentary to them, they might, having felt themselves to be so wronged by their sister States as to make War upon them and assert their independence of them, carry on the War so bravely and persistingly, that we should be glad to let them go. Nevertheless, according to the theory, to which the jugglers have won over the President, we should be bound to keep on exclaiming that the Union is indissoluble, and to keep on fighting, though with the cheerless prospect of no other result of our ceaseless fighting than our own extermination. Utterly absurd is this theory that a piece of paper shall or can hold States together, when their rights and interests demand their separation from each other! I believe in a political Constitution—but only in an alterable one. I believe in a political Union—but only in one that can be dissolved. "The body is more than raiment," says Jesus. No nation is to sacrifice herself to her dress.

Especially unhappy is it that the President has allowed these demagogical jugglers to take advantage of his unwariness at this point, and palm upon him this theory of an absolutely indissoluble Union. His whole argument to prove that the ante-War rights and relations of the Rebel States have never been broken nor, in the least degree, impaired, rests upon this theory. It is true that the whole argument must, necessarily, be as false as its foundation. Nevertheless, as it is a Presidential argument, it is very far from being uninfluential or harmless.

It is by force of this juggling with the words "Constitution" and "Union," that thousands, including, as appears from his Message, the President himself, have been made to believe that Congress, by its famous Resolution of July 22, 1861, virtually declared that the Seceding States might, any day or any year however distant, return to their former practical relations with the Union, and without having forfeited a single Constitutional right. This Resolution, which was, indeed, intended to show great liberality and generous forgiveness to the South, which, instead of being spurned, should have been promptly accepted, was not, however, intended to be an Indulgence for the future as well as an Absolution for the past—a promise of impunity for the wrongs she might yet commit, as well as for those she had already committed. A son angrily and wickedly quits his home. The father seeks to soothe and win him back by the promise of reinstating him in all his former favor. May the son, after he has spent nearly four years longer in murdering the inmates of that home and in trying to destroy the home itself, still plead that promise? No more absurd, however, would be

this plea than is the plea for the Rebel States, which is grounded on this Congressional Resolution. I say *for* instead of *by* the Rebel States. The South was too honorable, too decent, to set up any claims on the strength of this Resolution. The groundless and base plea originated with the demagogical jugglers of the North: though the South, in her straits and diminished self-respect, has, I am sorry to be obliged to admit, accepted it. By the way, it was in this wise that she came to yield to the temptation of toying in with these jugglers and declaring that she had never been out of the Union. How ashamed will her children be, that she consented to take upon her lips this glorying falsehood!—and, thereby, to ignore the fact that her unsurpassed bravery maintained her independent nationality through four long and bloody years—ay, and to cover over this fact with the disgraceful admission that, after all, she never got from under the old Constitution, and never rose to be any thing higher than a Constitution-breaker and a mere traitor. The South knows that she broke out of the Union, and has not yet returned into it. The jugglers cannot deceive her, at this point.

"This is the white man's country," is another set of words with which our demagogues juggle, and by which even the President is carried away captive. The object of the jugglery in this instance is to confine the Southern ballot to the hands of the white man. Many have been the conclusive arguments to prove that the day for dealing in this land with people by *races* has gone by forever; and that the black men, who played so brave and efficient a part in saving the country, should not, and will not, submit to the policy, which would thrust them away from the ballot-box to make room for the white men, who did what they could to destroy the country. It is useless to multiply these arguments. If the folly and wickedness of the South at this point shall, under the stimulus of the like folly and wickedness at the North, be great enough to bring on the attempt to get the black man again under the iron heels of the oppressor, then no arguments will suffice to prevent the attempt, and to save the South from scenes far more horrid than any she has hitherto witnessed. The enslaved negro is, from his great patience, the easiest man in the world to hold in slavery. But the freed negro is, from his inexhaustible and merciless resistance, the hardest man in the world to bring again under the yoke of slavery. If, therefore, the South shall make this mad attempt upon her freedmen, she will make it, not alone in contempt of their rights, but also of their history. Are we told, that it is not proposed to make them slaves? We answer that, in their circumstances, the proposition to deprive them of the ballot is all one with a proposition to make them slaves. And we add here, that, although there was some reason in arguing, a year or two ago, for *impartial* suffrage, it is too late to argue for it now. *Universal* suffrage has been granted and exercised: and that is a rope, which, once payed out, can never be drawn in. Universal suffrage has now become, "for better, for worse," a settled and permanent policy in our country—or, more properly speaking, a permanently acknowledged natural right.

Under the influence of these jugglers, the President cites amongst the justifications for not enfranchising him, the African's "constant tendency to relapse into barbarism". Let the Chinese, let the Hindoos, speak thus disparagingly of the African—but, inasmuch as poor Africa has, for centuries, been the prey of ravenous Christendom, it is, to a last degree, ungracious for devotees of Christendom to speak thus of him. During all these centuries, the policy of Christendom, active here and passive there, has been to sink Africa in the lowest depths of barbarism. It is quite bad enough for the man, whose legs have been chopped off, to be laughed at for not walking—but it is too bad for him, who chopped them off, to join in the laughter.

No, this is not the white man's country. It is neither his nor the black man's. To make it exclusively either, would be to make it the meanest and most abhorred of all countries. This, like every other country, is his who chooses to make it his; and his right in the choice comes, not at all from his complexion, but solely from his manhood.

These juggling rogues have so far got the upper hand of our unsuspecting President, as to inspire him with the fear of "the transfer of our political inheritance" to the negroes!—and, this too, though they are now, but one-eighth of our population, and, by reason of their not sharing, at all in our vast immigration, will not be one-twelfth of it, by the close of the present century. No wonder that jugglers, who can juggle at this rate, should be able to seduce even the elect.

Very inconsistent, at this point, are these jugglers. They are habitually decrying the intellect of the negro and extolling that of the white man; and yet they seem to believe that, in a struggle between the races for political ascendency, one of them will prove itself to be so smart, and the other so dull, as to make a single negro an overmatch for eight white men. They tell us, however, that, in such a struggle, the blacks will go together and the whites will divide. But surely, if the whites will not do so much as to unite, in order to prevent the success of the blacks, that success cannot be a very awful thing. The jugglers are very superficial in regard to this banding together of the blacks. They move in one body now, because they are pressed together by the fear of being virtually, if not literally, enslaved. When relieved of this fear, they will divide as much as the whites divide. This very day, the Southern negroes would, under the controlling influence of the leading Southern whites, be going in different political ways, but that these leaders have forfeited all claim to the confidence of the blacks by oppressively, insultingly, foolishly, opposing their enfranchisement. Not even now, however, is it too late for these leaders to regain the confidence of the blacks by recognizing in them their rights of manhood. This confidence regained, and they would be able to control the political action of the blacks for at least a quarter of a century—as it would require all that time for the slavery-imbrutted blacks to outgrow, in the school of Freedom, their dependence in political matters upon the advice and guidance of the educated race. The whites of the South wish still to rule the South. They ruled it before by trampling upon the blacks. Never, in this way, can they rule it again. And yet, by force of their superior numbers and superior intelligence, they are able to rule it again. To neither race, however, would the rule be happy, if it did not include a just and fraternal treatment of the wronged race.

I pass on from these traits of thought to say that not

over yet, is there Peace between the North and the South. But there will be, if the Democrats, who, much more than the Republicans, are in the practice of it, will stop this haggling, and if the Republican Congress will penitently confess that the North, as well as the South, was guilty of the oppression, which occasioned the War. This penitent confession would, because penitent, be followed up by a loan, or, preferably, a gift to help up our afflicted Southern sister out of that deep and distressful poverty, which she would never have been in, had the North been innocent of slavery. This loan or gift would not be too large, were it fifty or a hundred millions of dollars. The confession, I propose, is indispensable to convince the South that the North is honest; and the loan or gift to convince her that the North loves her. I add, that it is by creating such convictions in the Southern heart, that the North can win it. I have often, though it how easily "Reconstruction" would have been accomplished, had the Government acted toward the South upon a juster knowledge of her temperament and character. She is, indeed, impatient, passionate and wayward. But a brilliant intellect is not her only dower as these traits. She has a warm heart also; and such a heart loves to give out its confidences. Now, had the Government, on the surrender of the South, honestly and frankly confessed the responsibility of the whole nation for the War, and demonstrated in some amiable way the intensely fervent pity of the North for the War-desolated South, then would the South have cheerfully resigned herself into the hands of her conqueror, and given him a *carte blanche* on which to write the terms of a righteous "Reconstruction" and the conditions of a lover-to-be-broken Peace.

In excuse for refusing to extend the proposed help to the impoverished South, the North will say that she is herself a great loser by the War. She certainly is. But, inasmuch as the War grew out of her infamous partnership with the South in upholding slavery, and inasmuch as the South has been the greater, by the ruined, loser by that partnership, the North cannot, without falling far below the requirements of a certain good old maxim, refuse to relieve her partner of a portion of that partner's loss. This good old maxim, to which I refer, and which is of far wider than a mere technical or literal application, is: "Honor Among Thieves." Another excuse of the North for not coming to the relief of her less fortunate, but not more guilty, sister, is that the South has not yet repented. But, pray, when and where has the North repented? Her abolition of slavery did not come from her penitent sense of having been for generations a mercenary, mighty and merciless upholder of slavery. It was merely a measure for saving herself. Moreover, it was a very long-delayed and, even at the last, very reluctantly-adopted one, because it was a measure at the expense of her prejudices. The North was almost as unwilling, as the South to let the oppressed go free. Her habit of trampling on the negro, and of getting political, ecclesiastical and commercial gain from it, was so old and so strong, that she could not bear to have it broken up.

But it will also, be said that such a lavish use of money, as is here proposed, would make it more difficult to pay our already too great debt. On the contrary, it would exceedingly facilitate the paying of it. Peace would follow it: and we need but Peace—a cordial and true one—to make the credit of our nation correspond with her unequalled resources. How disgraceful to her that, whilst British Consols drawing three per cent. interest are now selling in London at but some seven or eight per cent. below par, the Bonds of our Government drawing six per cent. interest and payable, both principal and interest, in gold, are selling there at about twenty-nine per cent. below par! What but the lack of this Peace can explain this so very wide difference in the credit of these two nations! Such a Peace, as we advocate, would, by its bringing up our nation's credit into a just proportion to her vast ability, rid her of her present temptations to cheat her creditors; and would, thereby, avert the material and moral ruin with which these temptations threaten her. I say *material* ruin—for this threatened flooding of the country with "Greenbacks" would not only make the "Greenbacks" comparatively worthless, but would reduce to chaos all her financial relations and interests. I say *moral* ruin—for the cheating would corrupt her to the core, as well as brand her with ineffaceable infamy. A Peace between the North and the South, growing out of their common repentance for a common sin, and out of those deeds of love and pity for the South with which the North would quickly follow up that repentance, and out of the warm gratitude of the South in return for those deeds, would have an immense effect in elevating the moral character of the nation. Arguments for evading the full and honest payment of our twenty Bonds, grounded on cunning interpretations of their letter and legal import, would, then, fail to interest her. Enough in this connexion for her, then, to know would be 1st that the buyers of the Bonds expected them to be paid in coin, and would not otherwise have bought them; 2d that the Government, by witnessing this expectation and not objecting to it, justified it; and 3d that failing to sell them might have been failing to save itself. Just here, let me say how perilous it is to one's character to be an ingenious and acute lawyer! His delight in making points and in exercising his ingenuity and acuteness in establishing them, is but too apt to close his ear to the unexciting claims of common honesty.

Another of the good fruits of such a Peace as, for years, I have longed for, would be letting the disfranchised classes of whites at the South return to the ballot-box. Another would be the giving-up of "Confiscation." Desirable, as it is, that the large landed estates at the South should be broken up and distributed amongst her white and black poor, this can be brought about in a far better way than by the evil and hateful measure of "Confiscation"—in a way satisfactory to all. And still another of these good fruits would be the abandonment of the suit against Jefferson Davis. The nation would, then, be in a state of heart to feel that the South has suffered enough, and that there needs to be no punishment added to the suffering. And her eyes would then be opened to see how persecuting and mean it is to single out, in such a case as this, one person for punishment—and one, too, who is no more responsible for the War than is many another at the South, ay and many another at the North also. I can, at this moment, recall dozens of Northern clergymen, each one of whom by his wicked pro-slavery made himself far more guilty of the War than is Jefferson Davis. I say *far more guilty*—for, in this connexion it should

never be forgotten that, whilst at the South pro-slavery was an unfortunate inheritance quite as much as a responsible crime, at the North it was the adoption of a heartless and infamous calculation. Such was it on the part of her presses, politicians and priests, merchants and manufacturers. These all milked the cow whilst the South held her. How shameless in the North to be clamoring now for the punishment of Mr. Davis, and of the whole South in him! Oh, if ever men should keep themselves out of Court because they have not clean hands, then should our slavery-defiled nation shrink from going on against Mr. Davis, and cry out from the depths of her shame-filled heart for a NOLLE PROSEQUI! And, so too, would the eyes of the nation, then, be opened to see with what entire propriety the highest authorities, such as Vattel, Welcker, Macaulay, Hallam, Washington and Webster, placed themselves on the side of exempting from the charge of treason a strife, which has grown into the dimensions of a civil war. Ever, however, are we met at this point with the declaration that the cause of the South was a bad one. It was, truly, a bad and a very bad one. But every conqueror says this of the cause he has overcome: and hence, if we would strengthen the precedent for exempting from the charge of treason the leaders in a civil war for Freedom, we must do what we can to shut out the charge of treason from every civil war. Ireland, Poland, Italy and the Greeks all look to us, and to us especially, for this service. Nor must we fail to add that, however bad their cause, the defeated parties in all civil wars have suffered enough to satisfy our stage of civilization—a stage from which vengeance has so nearly died out.

Alas, what a sad mistake the Government fell into in having Jefferson Davis indicted! 1st the millions, who chose him for their leader, are much soured by this treatment of him and more by this treatment of themselves in him. 2d the North's punishing the South for the War serves to make the North still more self-righteous and still more insensible of her own large share of responsibility for the War. 3d it is not supposable that, in the trial of Mr. Davis, all the jurors will be convinced by the conclusive arguments for his acquittal. But as, from his acquittal, the world would infer that, in the matter of the War, the South was clearly in the right, so also, from the failure to convict him, it would infer that she was not clearly in the wrong. The simple facts in the case (and which the trial of Mr. Davis may go far to misrepresent or conceal) are 1st that the War grew out of as wicked a system of oppression as ever the sun shone upon; 2d that the North and the South together constituted the mighty host of oppressors; 3d that the North and the South were each guilty—clearly and largely guilty—of the War.

PRINCETON DEC. 20 1867. X.

Smith

HAS THE CHIEF JUSTICE A CASTING VOTE? 24

The Constitution reads:

4. The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate; but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided.

5. The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a President *pro tempore* in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States.

6. The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside.

To simplify the solution of our question we will bring together so much of these clauses, as pertains to it. The reading will then be as follows:

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside. The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments.

This reading, evidently, does not the least violence to the Constitution:—and, yet, were this its reading, probably no one would suspect that the Constitution intended to give more or less power to one presiding officer than to the other. By bringing together these sentences, which, in their subject matter, are connected with each other, such connection is seen more clearly and more impressively. It is only by treating some of these sentences, as if they were whole pages apart from each other, that Mr. Sumner can make a beginning in his very learned Argument. He could not so much as begin it without throwing the first sentence entirely out of sight.

And what reason was there why the Constitution should, in this case, have given less power to the Chief Justice than to the Vice President? It is true, that the Chief Justice is not a Senator. Neither is the Vice President. It is true, too, that the Vice President is to be supposed to be an able man: nevertheless, not so able as the Chief Justice to pass upon the questions, which arise in the course of an Impeachment Trial.

The most-relied-on argument for denying to the Chief Justice a casting vote is that: "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments." But whatever the Constitution means by "sole," it, manifestly, sees no incompatibility between its use of the word and its granting a casting vote to one, who is not a Senator. To say that its use of this word is such, as to shut out every one but a Senator from voting, is to involve the Constitution in a literal and gross contradiction of itself.

Mr. Sumner sees a very wide difference between the powers of one, who is "President of the Senate" and one, who "presides over it." I am not aware that the adopters of the Constitution saw the least of this difference: and there is nothing in the Debates of the Constitutional Convention to prove that the framers did. Indeed, I doubt whether, previous to the desire to impeach President Johnson, there was one person in the land, who so much as suspected any difference in the import of the two phrases.

The one short but sufficient answer to Mr. Sumner's columns of proof that British law and British usage do not allow the presiding officer to vote, is that American law and American usage do. Our Constitution does not forbid such voting; is not even silent respecting it; but expressly grants it. Our Constitution is not to be interpreted, at this point, in the light of British history. It goes, purposely and expressly, in the face of it. It is its own interpreter. The more of these British authorities that are cited, the clearer is it that the makers of our Constitution knew of them, and intended to set the Constitution against them. I agree with Mr. Sumner that Franklin must have known something of these authorities. The Constitution, which he helped to make, is proof that he went against them. How strange that Mr. Sumner can see proof in it that Franklin went with these authorities!

Mr. Sumner is, of course, compelled to admit that the Constitution, in according to the Vice President the right to vote, went against the usage of Parliament. The natural inference is that, in defining the powers of the Chief Justice, it had no more respect for this usage than it had in defining those of the Vice President. Mr. Sumner's calling the right of the Vice President to vote an "*exceptional* provision of the Constitution," is only an attempt to get rid by a bald and entirely groundless assumption of the greatest obstacle in the way of his Argument.

Mr. Sumner's long array of British authorities serves but to prove the reverse of what he intended to prove. Most satisfactorily does it prove that our Fathers did, notwithstanding such long array, *determine* in favor of a counter policy at this point of the power of the presiding officer. Hence, it is not too much to say, that the most of his Argument, instead of going to overthrow, goes to sustain, that simple, obvious interpretation of the Constitution on which the Chief Justice relies, and to which, I apprehend, the common sense of the people, wherever it is not misled by learned ingenuity or party spirit, will readily assent.

Mr. Sumner has, by his learning as well as by his integrity, eloquence and ability, made the nation his debtor. But eminent scholars, however great their advantages in other respects, are often in danger of overlooking those simple, natural, close-by meanings, that are patent to the eye of unlearned common sense, and of being carried away by their passionate love of learning to interpretations and constructions, which are artificial, far-fetched and fanciful. I say it with deference, that Mr. Sumner's Argument in the present instance proves that he is not exempt from the danger, which attends the habit of taking passionately learned surveys of subjects.

G. S.

Peterboro, April 11, 1868.

ACCEPT THE RIGHT MAN, WHICHEVER PARTY NOMINATES HIM!

A people are demoralized by being trained to the ready entertainment of charges of corruption against those, whom they select to be their rulers, teachers and exemplars. For, when they can easily suspect such ones of baseness and crime, their faith in man is destroyed. It scarcely need be added that, when they have no longer faith in man, they will be quick to acquiesce in the application of a very low standard of morality to their leaders, and a still lower one to themselves. I say a still lower one, inasmuch as they will, naturally, expect a less degree of moral worth in the masses than in the individual, who is, here and there, selected from the masses on account of his superior wisdom and virtue. How much better it would be to persuade the people that it is their duty to hold sacred the reputation of those, whom they elevate to posts of honor! For how much more like would they, then, be to elevate those only, whose reputation is worthy to be held sacred! Moreover, what could be more elevating to themselves than such carefulness in selecting their guides and representatives!

I have been led to make these remarks by seeing the recent calumnious and contemptuous treatment of the Chief Justice and such Senators as Mr. Fessenden and Mr. Trumbull. The flood-gates of detraction were opened upon Mr. Fessenden and Mr. Trumbull, because they voted for the acquittal of the President. I wish they had voted for his conviction. For, although I had not, previously, taken much interest in the proposition to impeach him, nevertheless, after reading those parts of his last Annual Message in which he traduces the colored citizens of our country, I was quite willing to have him removed from office. Were Victoria to take such an outrageous liberty with the Irish or Scotch or Welsh, she would quickly be relieved of her crown. I do not forget that insulting the negro is an American usage. But not with impunity should the President of the whole American people insult, in his official capacity, any of the races, which make up that people—least of all the race, which is, already, the most deeply wronged of them all. This gross violation of the perfect impartiality, which should ever mark the administration of the President's high Office—this ineffable meanness of assailing the persecuted and weak, whom he might rather have consoled and cheered, should not have been overlooked, but should have been promptly and sternly rebuked. How petty the President's affair with Mr. Stanton, compared with his unrelenting wicked war upon these black millions, to whose magnanimous forgiveness of our measureless wrongs against them, and to whose brave help of our Cause we were so largely indebted for its success!

I said that I wish Mr. Fessenden and Mr. Trumbull had voted for the conviction of the President. Nevertheless, in the light of their life-long uprightness, I have not the least reason to doubt that they voted honestly. Nay, in the light of their eminent wisdom, I am bound to pause and inquire of my candid judgment whether they did not vote wisely as well as honestly.

This clamor against the Chief Justice was not, as is pretended, occasioned by his conduct in the Impeachment Trial. That this conduct was wise and impartial, scarcely one intelligent man can doubt. This clamor proceeded from the purpose of preventing his nomination to the Presidency. It is said that he desires to be President. But a desire for this high Office is not, necessarily, culpable. Instead of being prompted in all instances by selfishness, it may in some instances be born of a high patriotism and a disinterested philanthropy. For one, I should rejoice to see the Chief Justice in the Presidency;—and, I say this, after a-many-years intimate acquaintance with him—after much personal observation of the workings of his head and heart. I, however, expect to vote for Grant and Colfax. I like them both; and, in the main, I like the platform on which they stand. Nevertheless, if contrary to my expectations, the Democrats shall have the wisdom to nominate the Chief Justice, and along with him a gentleman of similar views and spirit—a gentleman honest both toward the Nation's creditors and toward the negro—I shall prefer to vote for the Democratic Candidates. And why, in the case of such nomination by the Democrats, should not every Republican be willing, nay glad, to sustain the nomination? If the Democrats, at last sick and ashamed, as I have no doubt tens of thousands of them are, of ministering to the mean spirit of caste—prating for "a white man's government," and defying the sentiment of the civilized world—shall give up their nonsense and wickedness, and nominate for office such men as Republicans have been eager to honor—how wanting in magnanimity and in devotion to truth, and how enslaved to Party, would Republicans show themselves to be, were they not to welcome this overture, and generously respond to these concessions!

By all means should the Republicans let, ay and help, the Democratic Party succeed at the coming Election, provided only that its candidates be the representatives of a real and righteous, instead of a contaneous and spurious, Democracy. That success would bring to an end this too-long-continued War between Republicans and Democrats. That success would turn us all into Republicans and all into Democrats. The old and absorbing issues about Slavery and its incidents would, then, have passed away. The "everlasting negro," having gained his rights, would then have sunk out of sight. Doubtless, new Parties would, ere long, be formed. But they would be formed with reference to new questions or, more generally, to old ones, which, by reason of the engrossing interest in the Slavery Battle, have been compelled to wait very long, and with very great detriment to the public weal, for their due share of the public attention.

And, then too, when the quarrel between the Republican and Democratic Parties had ended, Peace between the North and the South would speedily come. Hitherto, the Republican Party has been so anxious to keep a bad Party out of power, that it has not been in a mood to use or study all the means for producing Peace between the North and South. It should, immediately on the surrender of the South, have inculcated on the North the duty of penitently confessing her share of the responsibility for the War—a share as great as the South's, since the responsibility of the North for Slavery, out of which the War grew, was as great as the South's. Quickly would the South have followed this example of penitent confession. And, then, the two would have rivalled each other in expressions of mutual forgiveness and mutual love. Amongst these expressions would have been the avowal of the North to charge no one with Treason; and to open wide the door for the return of every exile, who had not, by some mean or murderous violation of the laws of war, shut himself out of the pale of humanity. And amongst these expressions would have been the joyful consent of the North to let fifty or a hundred millions go from the National Treasury toward helping her War-impoverished sister rise up out of her desolations. The heart of the South would, now, have been won; and she would have manifested the fact by tendering to the North a *carte blanche*—fooling no fear that there would be any designed injustice in the terms of "Reconstruction," which her forgiving and generous foe should write upon it. Yes, there would, then, have been Peace between the North and the South—a true and loving and enduring Peace. Ashamed of their past, they would unitedly and cordially have entered upon the work of making a future for our country as innocent and as happy as that past had been guilty and sorrowful. It is not, now, too late to have, *by such means*, such a Peace. We should, surely, have it, were there to be, at the coming Election, that oneness between Republicans and Democrats, which good sense and good feeling call for.

Is it said that the money, which in loans or (preferably) gifts to the South, I ask to have used in effecting this Peace would make the Peace cost too much? I answer that it would be returned tenfold. The improvement in our National credit, resulting from such a Peace, would, very soon, enable our Government to borrow at an interest of four per cent. Comparatively small, then, would be our taxes, and, by the way, comparatively small, then, would be the temptation to cheat the Nation's creditors.

Peekskill June 12 1868. G. C.

GERRIT SMITH TO GENERAL LEE.

26

Peterboro' September 25th 1868.

General R. E. LEE, Virginia,

I honored General Rosecrans for his patriotism and bravery in the War. Nevertheless, his Letter to you is so exceedingly offensive on account of the servile, flattering, false spirit with which it overflows, that I found it quite easy to toss it aside and forget it. I would forget him, also. For, when a man has done good service to his country, it is painful to remember him, if to remember him is but to loathe his apostacy. But your Reply to General Rosecrans is what I cannot forget, nor cease to grieve over. I have thought of it, perhaps every day, since I read it. Very sorry am I that you wrote it. Very sorry am I that you did not continue your dignified, beautiful and exemplary silence in regard to the political affairs of the country.

And is it so, that General Lee, with all his wisdom, has nothing better to offer us, as the result of this slavery-begotten and slavery-overthrowing War, than the re-instatement of slavery?—nothing better to offer us, in return for all the expenditure of treasure, and blood, than the restoration of the horrid cause of this horrid War? Your Letter shows, that it is even so. Far am I from calling in question your sincerity, when you disclaim all expectation of the re-establishment of chattel-slavery. But to argue to you that slavery, virtual, if not literal, must ever attend the disfranchisement of a race, and especially when it is the only disfranchised race, would be a superfluity insulting to your excellent understanding. Slavery attended the disfranchisement of your blacks, before the War. It also attended it, after the War. Under the Governments, which President Johnson set up at the South—and which, by the way, he had no more right to set up than you or I had—under, in other words, his policy of confiding all political power to the hands of the whites—a policy immediately espoused by the whole Democratic Party—a type of slavery, more cruel and crushing than the former one, was, at once, entered upon. As a matter of course, if this Party shall succeed at the coming Election, and shall be able to execute its General Blair threat of bloody disfranchisement, and of bloody restoration of the white man's Governments, your blacks will, because, amongst other things, of the deep and undying enmity kindled against them by their having taken up arms against their oppressors, be more grievously oppressed than they were when in chattel slavery.

But why should it be doubted that you and such, assigned your Letter, would, if circumstances invited it, be in favor of reviving chattel-slavery? Your Letter virtually denies that to enslave your fellow-men is to oppress them. Nay, it goes so far as, in effect, to declare that to doom them and their endless posterity to stripes and chains and unrequited toil and reyless ignorance and the loss of every right, is "to look upon them with kindness." If you gentlemen do not see that to enslave men in the past was to oppress them, and to lack kindness toward them, why should it be supposed that you would see oppression or unkindness in their future enslavement? If you justify, instead of condemning, yourselves for having heretofore crushed the negro when he was in your hearts to hold you back from crushing him hereafter? If slavery is pleasant for you to look back upon, why should it not be pleasant for you to look forward to?

Deeply have I deplored the short comings of the North toward the South. When the South, because less than the North, not in bravery, but in numbers and resources, had to surrender, the North should have recognized and confessed herself to be the fellow-sinner of the South—to be as guilty, responsible, as she for the War, because as guilty responsible for its cause. The North should not have found, in her heart to charge any one with Treason for his part in the War. She should have felt herself to be morally incompetent to put any of the Southern leaders, even yourself or Jefferson Davis, on trial for Treason: and she should have been eager to expend, if need be, a hundred millions from the National Treasury in relieving the most urgent wants of her War-impoverished sister. But, General Lee! the lack of the North, in these and other respects, does not justify the failure of the South to repent of slavery. Least of all does it justify the union of her white men with the Democratic Party for the purpose of re-establishing slavery. It is true that the Republican Party did not do its whole duty toward the South. It would, however, ere this time, have relieved your disfranchised classes, and produced Peace between the North and South, and restored the credit of the Nation, and reduced to four or less than four per cent. the interest she pays, had it not been for the hinderances encountered in a hostile President and the encouragement to embarrass and resist it, afforded by those hinderances. It was this encouragement which stirred up the whites of the South to their unreasonable demands. Did ever any other conquered people take so insulting an attitude toward their conqueror, as did this toward the mildest of conquerors? But I would not judge my Southern brethren too harshly at this point. They were, at first, entirely willing to accept the situation. But they were tempted by the Northern Democrats to cast off a becoming modesty and decency, and to be guilty of bad faith and defiant spirit.

How sad that the white men of the South should look upon the Republican Party as the enemy of the South! In the success of this Party—in the election of those just and wise men, Grant and Colfax—is the salvation of the South. Peace—a righteous and enduring Peace—would come of it. The white men of the South have but two enemies. The Republican Party is neither of them. Their own wicked hearts—wicked, because still refusing to repent of slavery—is one of them; and the other, and far wickeder one, is the Democratic Party, whose only hope of re-ascendency being in the resurrection of slavery, is ever at work to inflame those wicked hearts, and to counsel and contrive that resurrection.

You white men of the South have made your choice. This choice is to go for the Democratic Party. You will probably, be disappointed in the Election. For the North, though extensively corrupted by the arts of the leaders of the Democratic Party, can hardly be brought to give a majority of her votes to a Party, which goes openly for cheating the Nation's creditors, and for taking up arms to bring back under the yoke of slavery a race to whose magnanimous forgetfulness of their immeasurable wrongs and to whose brave hearts and stalwart arms the salvation of our country is so largely due.

I said that you would, probably, be disappointed in the Election. Happy, thrice happy for you, if you shall be. For the War, that would come of the success of the Democratic Party, would be very different in its character and results from what you dream of. You, who were slave-masters, are deceived in your calculations by the facility with which you formerly disposed of your blacks. You forget that, whilst they were then but your disposable chattels, they are, now, your self-disposing fellow-freemen. You ignore History. You overlook the fact that the African, though easily kept under foot, is not easily, after his rights have been restored to him, brought under foot again. You forget the torrents of blood in which France learned this lesson, when, near the beginning of this Century, she sought to bring back a few hundred thousand freedmen in the Western part of St. Domingo, under the yoke of slavery, and in which Spain also learned it when, only a few years ago, she attempted a substan-

...ly like op...sition ... of ... such ... numb... of the ... in the Western end of the same Island. You will not succeed in wresting the ballot and freedom from four millions of blacks, whose women are as brave and hardy as their men, and all of whom can live in mountains and marshes. I see, in a menacing and mean Address of the Democrats of Charleston to the blacks of that City, that the Democrats of New York have again promised you help to fight your pro-slavery battles. They failed to fulfil their promise before. They will fail to fulfil their promise now. As before, they will talk for you, but shrink from fighting for you. If they have no conscience to make cowards of them, nevertheless they have a wholesome dread of encountering the millions, who will be as enraged by such a nefarious attempt to rob them of rights, which it is for their life to retain, as would be the she-bear or lioness by the attempt to rob her of her young.

Pro-slavery Gentlemen of the South! you cannot too soon give up your purpose to plunder the blacks of the ballot. Your attempt to put it in execution will bring on a scene of horrors, such as living man has never witnessed. "There will be blood even unto the horse-bridles." Besides that it will lie an attempt against an infuriated foe, it will encounter the sympathies of nearly all of Earth as well as quite all of Heaven. Give up the attempt! Cease from your hatred and scorn of your colored brother. Take him by the hand. Instruct and guide him—and so will he bless you by his freedom and his ballot. The sooner you bring yourselves to admit that the right to vote is entirely irrespective of complexion, the better. You, Sir, and the other gentlemen, who signed your Letter, would have us believe that the blacks of the South are too ignorant to vote. Allow me to reply, that it does not lie in the mouth of those, who used their superior knowledge to destroy their country, to speak disparagingly of the inferior knowledge, which others used in saving that country.

But, I need write no more. Indeed, I had no encouragement to write at all. For, when was it ever known that the oppressing race did not underrate and despise the strength and resources of the oppressed race? And when, too, was it ever known that the oppressor, accustomed, as he ever is, to flatter himself and be flattered by others, would consent to open his ear to the words of warning?

Ere closing however, I must say three things to you, which, if not as polite as they are personal, are, nevertheless, things which I trust, can be said without going counter to the rules of good-breeding.

1st. When you accepted the easy terms on which General Grant, as generous as he is brave and just, allowed you to surrender, neither the prophet who foretold the crimes of Hazel, nor any other prophet, could have persuaded you that, in little more than three years, you would, in return for the generosity shown to you and your army, be found in league with the worst enemy of this nation. For the Democratic Party is incomparably its worst enemy. By the way, I rejoiced in those easy terms of surrender, and one of my strongest desires for the election of Grant springs from my confidence, that *President* Grant will be as generous and conceding to the South as was *General* Grant. He will be as ready in his civil, as he was in his military capacity to make every concession to her that is not forbidden by justice and reason.

2d. Bred, as you were, in a school of honor, and, all your life, disdaining to do aught which your judgment pronounces dishonorable, you could not have foreseen that you would be guilty of calling on this Nation to do a meanor, as well as wickeder, thing than had ever been done by any Nation. The crimes of this nation against the colored race are beyond description, and yet this race, surpassing every other in affectionateness and patience and forgiveness, dropped those crimes from its memory, and took up arms to save the Nation that had wronged it. Now, for this nation to undertake to throw this race under the feet of its old oppressors, is to undertake to reach the very climax of perfidy and meanness and wickedness. Nevertheless, this is just what you advise it to do. I know that the leaders of the Democratic Party are but in keeping with their character, when they go forward in this undertaking—...ever ... which they hesitate to perpetrate—if only the interests of their Party call for the perpetration. But I, also, know that whoever else can, consistently, have a part in this cruelty and baseness, a man of honor should refuse to stain himself with it. Let me, in this connection, say that, since I have not, for between thirty and forty years, belonged to any one of the great political Parties of the country, my speaking against the Democratic Party cannot be attributed to a party spirit.

3d. And, when you surrendered, how little did you apprehend that you would claim, as you do in your Letter, "their rights under the Constitution" for those who had defied it and trampled it under foot. Preposterous claim! They have no rights at all under the Constitution. As well might a devil in hell plead his rights under the Bible he has scouted. They have no rights under any law, save the law of War—no rights but those, which the conqueror is bound, in justice and humanity, to concede to the conquered. Scarcely anything in the Republican Party has disgusted me more than its occasional loose talk about the *Constitutional* mode of settling matters between the North and the South. The word "Constitution" should never have been spoken between the North and the South until the War between them had ceased, and the return of Peace had been mutually recognized. The War is not yet ended: and there can never be Peace in our land, until this alliance between Northern Democracy and Southern Pro-Slavery, shall be effectually and forever broken up. Never was their alliance closer than now, and never was their purpose to crush the negro deeper or more malignant than now.

If the Southern uprising amounted to no more than a Rebellion, then all involved in it were Rebels and Traitors. Then all of them had, still, rights under the Constitution—especially and emphatically, the right to be punished under it! But it is, as you assert, and as, in numberless Arguments, I have asserted, that this uprising attained to the dimensions and dignity of a Civil War, when did it pass from under the Constitution, and take its place under the Law of War. Of course, it did not surprise me to find the Northern Democratic leaders telling the South, that she was still under the Constitution. No falsehood, no baseness, on their part can surprise me. But, I confess, that it did surprise me to find high-minded Southern gentlemen accepting this version of the matter, and thus degrading their valorous and mighty movement into a mere Rebellion; and thus, with their own hands, putting halters around their own necks, by which to be hung as Traitors, whenever the Government might choose to hang them.

Respectfully yours

GERRIT SMITH.

P. S. In looking over what I have written, I see that I have not so much as mentioned the name of your Presidential Candidate. But the omission is not important. For, in the first place, there is scarcely a possibility that the Seymour and Blair ticket will be elected: and, in the next place, if it should be, Mr. Seymour would not be the President. In that event, the shedding of blood would, as was so frankly, so brutally, foretold by Mr. Blair, be the policy of the Democratic Party. But the gentle nature, bland manners and persuasive lips of Mr. Seymour would be entirely out of harmony with this barbarous policy. Whatever the difficulties to be disposed of, and however hard the knots to be untied, his reliance will ever be upon Blarney instead of Blood. Hence, Mr. Seymour, even if elected President, would not be the President. He would have either to stand aside, or be put aside. If this Murder Party, which has, within the last three years, murdered, for their political opinions, more than a thousand men at the South, shall come to be in the ascendant all over the land, murder may be well nigh as common in the North, as in the South. Human life in this country would be made cheap by the success of the Party, which, not in spite, but in consequence, of his murderous programme, nominated General Blair for Vice President—ay, and emphatically, for President also.

USED TO IT. NOT USED TO IT.

BY GERRIT SMITH.

Used to it. Not used to it. These and equivalent phrases explain many things in human conduct, which cannot be explained otherwise.

Slavery is the superlative piracy. Nevertheless our people clung to the political parties, which upheld it. They were used to doing so, and therefore continued to do so. Had these parties come to patronize piracy on property, their members would have hurried away from them. For, although to rob a man of his possessions is an infinitely less guilty form of piracy than to rob him of himself, and although they could, by force of use, remain in parties, which upheld a worse crime than murder, they would have instantly recoiled from parties, that set out to sanction this other crime—this comparative peccadillo. No right-minded parent denies that slavery is a worse crime than murder, for there is no right-minded parent, who would not rather have his child in the grave of the murdered than under the yoke of slavery.

It is in respect to the dramshop as it was in respect to slavery. Our people, having always belonged to the parties, that uphold this great manufactory of paupers, incendiaries, madmen and murderers, keep on belonging to them. Quickly, however, would they forsake parties, which should come to protect theft or forgery. And, yet, even theft and forgery would, in the light of their comparatively trivial effects, almost whiten into virtues by the side of dramselling. In this case, as in that of slavery, we see that men will spare the greatest of crimes, if only they are used to sparing them. Our worthy Senator, Mr. O'Donnell of Lewis County, would not consent to remain a day longer in his political party should it so much as wink at horse-stealing. Nevertheless you cannot get him to say that he will ever quit it, do it however much more than it is now, doing to uphold the dramshop. And this is so, notwithstanding he would rather have all his horses stolen than have his son take his first drink of death where drunkards and murderers are made. And this is so, too, notwithstanding our political party issues were never fewer nor feebler than they now are, and our parties consequently never in so favorable a mood to listen to arguments against the dramshop.

One reason why Senator O'Donnell and thousands of other earnest Temperance men can consent to cling to a party, though it shall never cease to sustain the dramshop, and would, at the same time, instantly and indignantly refuse to belong to one, which should sanction the comparatively petty crime of theft, is that whilst they are unused to seeing well-meaning and respectable men amongst thieves, they are used to seeing them, here and there, amongst dramsellers. It is true that there are wrong-doers who, being unconscious that they are such, may therefore retain some good traits of character. The darkness in which they grope makes this possible. When, however, we are judging of their deeds, we are not to go down into their darkness, but to stand up in our own light. We are to judge of dramselling by its own evil character, and we are not to soften our judgment by considering what good there may be in the character of this or that dramseller. So far, indeed, from this, we are to bear in mind that the better the man whose occupation is bad, the worse the influence of his occupation.

I see in the newspapers the proceedings of a State Temperance Committee assembled recently at Syracuse. Not one word is there in these proceedings of their duty to quit their parties, even though these parties should never quit their league with dramshops. The members of this Committee are used to staying in their parties "through thick and thin"; and stay in them therefore they will, even though the policy of these parties should become a more and more rum-soaked one. Nor a word is there in these proceedings of the duty of Government to protect person and property. How could there be, when the Committee knew so well that the first step in discharging this duty is to suppress the dramshop—that nuisance which does more than all things else to peril person and property! Nay, so far is this Committee from inculcating or even recognizing the obligation of Government to forbid the very great crime of dramselling, as to imply that it shall be suffered to exist in those localities where the people wish it to exist. Would this Committee say that Government may rightly leave it to the people of the town to decide whether in such town theft or forgery shall be committed with impunity? Certainly not. Why then may Government tolerate in the locality, that is tenacious of the accursed thing, the far greater crime of dramselling? The inconsistency of these gentlemen is explained by the fact that they are used to seeing Government deal with theft or forgery as a crime, and not used to seeing it deal thus with dramselling.

It is true that in one of their Resolutions the Committee bristle up into a "demand" upon the "next Legislature." Reading farther, however, we find that this "demand"—this big word—is not for prohibition, but is only for measures that will "*tend* to prohibit the sale of intoxicating beverages." Vain is this demand, not only because men will differ, both ingenuously and disingenuously, as to what will thus "*tend*," but because the "demand," not being backed up by the declared purpose of withdrawing from parties that shall persist in licensing the dramshop, but accompanied by the well-known purpose to continue in them, must be utterly impotent and farcical.

Alas, how this Committee trifles with the pressing and distressful needs of the people! Alas, how these needs were trifled with by the Syracuse Convention, which appointed this Committee! How unfair it was for men to come to that Convention, postponing in their hearts the cause of Temperance to the claims of party! How immeasurable the damage done to this dear and sacred cause by that Convention's evading with shilly-shally words and deceptive Resolutions the imperative duty of telling the dramshop parties, that if they will persist in sustaining the dramshop, the people will be bound to withdraw from them!

Used to it, and not used to it! How many things we do from no higher reason than that we are used to do them! And how many things we leave undone from no more worthy reason than that we are not used to do them! How needful that we rise so far above our habits, as to be able to plead reason rather than our habits for our doings and our not-doings. What a vast and blessed revolution would, in this wise, be achieved, in our politics, morals, religion, and, in short, in all our relations! A man may, from habit, be a slave to rum and rum-parties—but, surely, reason bids him quit both.

I see that the two most prominent objections to a prohibitory law continue to be harped on.

1st. To make it a very odious encroachment on domestic freedom, it is called a sumptuary law—whereas it does not search the family, nor forbid the family from supplying itself with liquors. It is *dramselling* only that it forbids. The prohibitory law bears no resemblance to a sumptuary law. The object of a sumptuary law is to regulate the living of the people. The object of the prohibitory law is to protect their person and property. We do not ask Government to espouse any moral reform—not even the Temperance reform: and the only reason why we ask it to suppress the dramshop is because the protection of person and property being the province of Government, it is bound to protect the people from the burnings, minimings and murders chargeable on the dramshop. We admit

that is incidental to such suppression would be an incomputable benefit to the cause of Temperance. But, surely, there is nothing in this to excuse Government from suppressing the dramshop. Neither the good nor ill, which is incidental to any of the necessary work of Government in protecting person and property, should be confounded with that work or included in its responsible aims. I repeat it—we do not ask Government to help the Temperance Reform. We leave that reform in the hands of the people alone. But this is no reason why Government should put obstacles in its way—least of all, the insuperable obstacle of the dramshop. I would add in this connexion that, although it may be proper, and indeed very important, for the friends of Temperance to dissuade from drinks which do but dull the drinker, Government nevertheless is to concern itself about no other drinks than those which craze him and make him a fearful peril to the public safety. Drinks, which merely stupefy, are no more to be noticed by Government than are dinners which merely stupefy.

It is to be regretted that any prohibitory law *names* the proscribed drinks. Intoxicating or unintoxicating should be the only legal distinction between the proscribed and the permitted drinks: and the law should leave it to the jury to decide in each case of prosecution whether the drink in question is or is not intoxicating—is or is not crazing—is or is not a drink, which makes the drinker perilous to the public. The difference at this point in different prosecutions would be a small evil compared with the law's declaring that drinks of this or that name are to be held, in advance, to be intoxicating. The leaving of this, the chief question, to a jury—to the people—would be a highly popular feature in the law.

2d. The other objection to a prohibitory law is that it cannot be enforced. I own that it cannot be by such Governments as the world is generally cursed with. It was folly to expect that the Governments, which protected slavery in our country, would defend human rights: and it were folly to rely on Governments, which look directly or indirectly to the dramshop for their support, to be virtuous enough to go against it. A new style of Governments is needed. Nor will that need be supplied until we shall have a new style of people. Nor this, until there be a new style of politics. Nor will Governments, people, or politics be what they should be until a new style of religion shall underlie and remould them all. A religion of dogmas and mysteries which, as we have always seen, can, as the occasion of the hour may call for, be turned for or against slavery and for or against rum and for or against other abominations, will not suffice to work the changes for which the world is perishing. Indispensable to this end is the prevalence of the religion of reason and righteousness—the religion of intelligible common sense—the religion of practical justice and goodness—the religion, which Jesus so happily declared is taught by our God-given nature, when he said to the multitude: "And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" Let this be the religion of the pulpits of our land for five years, and there would be scarcely a dramshop left in the land—not so much as one with the consent of Government. Come blessed day! come quickly! That day will not be hastened by such a Convention and such a Committee, as I have referred to in this paper—nor by any other Convention or Committee which, ingeniously and cunningly, tries "How not to do it" under the semblance of "How to do it." I saw in the newspapers that an eloquent gentleman preached a sermon in the recent Camp Meeting near Troy on the *possible simultaneousness of justification and sanctification*. I could but think how much more good he would have done if, instead of preaching that sermon, he had simply said: "I have sinned against the Lord in that I made a speech in that sham Temperance Syracuse Convention, my leading object in which was to protect the Republican Party, when it should have been to overthrow the dramshop at whatever expense to political, ecclesiastical or any other parties." Perhaps, I undervalue the theme of this sermon—such themes being quite too deep for my shallowness, and quite outside of my practical, two-and-two-make-four type of religion.

I am conscious that I weary the public ear with my many words against the dramshop and dramshop parties; and that I may be thought to take credit to myself for having very sternly refused for these forty years to allow intoxicating drinks to be sold in my buildings, and for as sternly refusing to vote for candidates who are in favor of the dramshop. But these things do not minister to my self-complacency. There were especial reasons, but no especial merit on my part, for them. In the light of the fact that the dramshop has poured floods of wretchedness and ruin through several of the latest generations of my kindred, I should be a monster of insensibility and unnaturalness were I to take any lower ground than I do in my war upon it. If others, who are more distant and, therefore, less-afflicted witnesses of the horrors of intemperance, can be excused for keeping peace with dramshop parties, with dramshops, with the manufacturing of their death-drinks, or with the furnishing of materials for their manufacture, it, by no means, follows that I can be—I, who have, nearly all my lifetime, been brought into contact with those horrors, and have seen so many near and dear ones writhing and perishing in them.

July 28, 1869.

THE TRUE BASIS OF RELIGION?

A Discussion in the Meeting of Liberal Christians at Concord, N. H., Oct. 27, 1875.

The question under discussion is virtually, "What should be the accepted foundation of religion?" Let us first inquire what it has, thus far, been; and then, I will pass on to say what, in my judgment, it should be. In all the past, as well as in all the present, history including tradition (if I may be allowed, for convenience, to bring the oral as well as the written under the name of history) has been the only recognized foundation of the popular or wide-spread religions. In christendom the bible is the chief, and with nearly all Protestants the sole basis of religion. In other words, this book's history of things alleged to have been said or done is such basis. In this wise is it that in Turkey religion rests on the Koran, and in Hindostan on the Vedas. Thus too, did it rest in ancient Persia on the Zendavesta. But as religion, above all things else, needs to rest on certain truth, it must, wherever it is founded on history, partake of the uncertainty of its foundation, and be, so far, untrustworthy. Nothing is more proverbially uncertain than history. Sir Robert Walpole made it much more than uncertain when he said: "Do not read history to me—for that I *know* must be false." How very widely different Macauley's history of William Penn from that, which the Quakers had received and implicitly relied on! And, yet, Penn had been dead but little more than a century, and both he and his father were so eminent, that the materials for making up a substantially true history of either could not have been scanty. How unlike each other would be two histories of our Great Rebellion, had Horatio Seymour written one of them, and his neighbor and brother-in-law, Roscoe Conkling, the other! I would not disparage history. It is of great value, notwithstanding all its inaccuracies and uncertainties. The histories of Greece and Rome have taught us much of those grand nations. Nevertheless, no one will say, that all their narrations are truthful. I do not forget the claim that the sacred and authoritative books of each of the religions referred to were, by means of miracles or other forms of supernaturalism, written without error; and have, by such means, been, ever since, protected from change of thought or word. But this claim is too extravagantly superstitious to need refutation. To say, for instance, that the bible whose numerous and diverse parts, written when, where, or by whom no one certainly knows, is, in its every line, free from all error, is ridiculously absurd. This incessant assertion that the whole bible is the "word of God" proceeds as much from cowardly misgivings, cunning, and the apprehension that "our craft is in danger", as did the cry: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" These priests, who jaggle with the bible, well aware that they can no longer juggle successfully; if they leave the people to see blots or even the least imperfections in it, continue to dishonor God and damage man by their persistency in calling the most absurd and the most blasphemous things in it the "word of God." The big story about the big fish, and the big story about the accommodating and slaughter-loving sun and moon, and the big story about Elijah and the rain, and the wicked story about God's commanding the murder of all the women and children in the captured cities, and the abominable stories about God's putting all the wives of Saul into David's bosom, and about His various other Mormonisms—all these and other scarcely less ridiculous and disgusting stories the people are told they must, either receive as the "word of God," or go to hell. Not strange is it that many a rough but honest man cries out: "Then I'll go to hell!" And how natural is it that, in our age when science is training the people to exact adequate evidence for what they believe, this enormous and shameful tax, which priestcraft imposes upon their credulity, should be followed by a strong reaction!—so strong, indeed, as to involve the shaking of faith in important truths of the bible! The pulpit is loudly lamenting the spread of infidelity. But, for its whole-eyed stupidity, it would see that it is its own work, which it is so loudly lamenting.

Since, then, books and traditions are not to be the foundation of religion, let us proceed to inquire what is. And, first, let me say that, inasmuch as the remedies for even the greatest errors are generally found to be very simple and very near by, so we might, in advance, be pretty confident of not having to go far nor out of plain paths to find the only foundation of the one true religion. The wise and good had long been studying how to dispose of slavery. At length a woman (Elizabeth Heyrick) informed them how. *It was simply to stop slaveholding!* So, too, the wise and the good had long taxed their wits to discover the remedy for drunkenness. It finally came to light: and, simple as the remedy in the other case, it was but to *stop rum-drinking*. And now we find that the remedies for those gigantic vices are no more simple, no more certain, and no nearer at hand than is the basis of religion. This basis is soon to be nature;—not a book written by erring men, but a book written by the unerring God;—not a human uncertainty, but the Creator's certainty. I mean by nature as well our own physical, mental, moral, spiritual human nature, as also whatever else of nature falls within our observation and study. Nature, as well as Jesus (who may also be called a part of nature) teaches that we are to love our fellow man as ourself and God supremely. For it teaches, not only that our fellow man's rights and interests, being equal to our own, are to be respected as our own, but also that for the gift of our being we owe to the Giver all the gratitude and praise and love of which so sublime a being is capable. It needs no more than a very superficial acquaintance with our being to show us that we are made to be religious and not irreligious—for the more religious we are the more benevolent we are, and the more benevolent we are the happier we make ourselves as well as others. On the other hand, the more irreligious we are the more selfish we are, and the more selfish we are the more unhappy we make both ourselves and others. Nothing short of religion can satisfy the demands of our being. But is nature sufficient to teach and illustrate religion? Undoubtedly, we should find it so if, instead of having become an unnatural, we were still natural. All that religion requires of us is obedience to the laws of nature. To be perfect in this obedience is to be perfect in religion. Nature reveals religion to us; and religion, in turn, bids us be true to nature; and exacts nothing else from us than to be natural. But those mistaken religions, of which we have been speaking, have ever disparaged nature, and ever made war upon it. Some of them fight it on Shaker planes, and some of them fight it on Mormon planes. Some of them crucify it, and some of them plead its sacred name for all manner of licentiousness and excess. Devotees of some of these religions lacerate and macerate and mutilate themselves. With most religionists fasting is regarded as a high merit. Nevertheless, no fasting is meritorious, nor less than positively sinful which brings harm to the body. Nature protests as earnestly against wronging one as another of the elements or constituents of our being. There is no part of it that she does not sacredly cherish; and she will accept no plea for benefitting either the understanding or the heart, if the benefitting is to be at the expense of the physical health. The religion, which sings:

> "Nature must count her *gold* but dross,
> If she would gain the heavenly land,"

ennobles herself to have sprung from the wisdom of heaven—nevertheless, she is born of the fanaticisms of earth. Such a religion, in its representing nature to be the enemy of man, necessarily represents it to be, also, the enemy of God. But nature, being the work of God, is (unless like man it has fallen away from Him) the friend of God, and can, therefore, be no hinderance to His designs and provisions for the onward and upward way of His children. More than all this; the position that nature is at war with man involves the absurdity that God is at war with Himself.

In this connexion let me say that people should stop talking about man's *lower* nature. He has no *lower* nature. His nature is all high, since whatever he does with it, even eating or drinking, he can and should "do all to the glory of God." It is true that men forsake their high nature, and often descend very low;—but their departures from it and their violations of it are anti-nature, and must not be confounded with nature. When Jesus bids us take up our cross, he bids us crucify not our nature, but only its corruptions, or rather that, which we have put in the place of nature. He requires in this nothing else than that we return from deserting our nature and consent to abide in it. To be

[illegible] into that holy and beautiful nature which [illegible] foolishly [illegible], and to get up again to [illegible] whence our sins and, may be, the sins of [illegible] who had carried us so far down [illegible] and this only is the regeneration he calls for. [illegible] who should wonder, if such a new birth cannot be accomplished without the help of those blessed influences which we would fain believe are forever flowing from the bosom of God throughout His universe?

I have argued that nature is the foundation of our religion. But do I give the bible no place in this foundation? None whatever. And is, then, the bible of no value? It is of incalculable value. For, notwithstanding the things in it, which, because they are revolting to reason and nature and therefore to religion, should not have been put into it, it is, beyond all comparison, the best of books. Here, far more than in all other books, are the lessons, that help us build up the true religion on the true foundation. And do I make no account of Jesus either in this foundation? None at all. Nevertheless, in respect to the superstructure upon it, I gratefully and lovingly recognize him to be the master builder. I often see him put by radical religionists into the same category with Confucius, Socrates, Plato and other eminent teachers. But he is a teacher so immeasurably above all other teachers, that he should never be classed with any of them. Never was there other teacher so taught of God. Never other teacher, whose moral and spiritual character so far realizes our highest conceptions of God's moral and spiritual character. In respect to such character, well may it be said of him that he is filled with his Father's fulness—that he is even "God manifest in the flesh". Nevertheless, preeminent teacher though he is, he did not teach a new religion. He but taught the spirit and principles and commended and urged the claims of the one unchangeable and everlasting religion of nature. Until human nature is changed, its religion cannot be changed. How emphatically Jesus recognized the competence of human nature to understand the religion of human nature, when he said to the people: "Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" Repeatedly, when he would prove to his disciples the loving and unlimited beneficence of God, he goes straight to the teachings of nature. He inculcates upon them the duty of being good to all by calling their attention to some fact in nature, which goes to prove that *God* is good to all—such a fact, for instance, as that sunlight comes to the evil and the good, and showers fall upon the just and the unjust. And it is in connexion with his citing this proof in nature of God's impartial goodness, that he reminds them that such goodness on their part is one of the ways for them to become perfect even as their Father in heaven is perfect. When, too, he would relieve them of anxious care for their food and clothing, he again draws from nature the lessons they need. He bids them "consider the ravens and the lilies", and to derive from God's feeding and clothing them the irresistible inference that he has not failed to put food and clothes within the reach of His children—of His own sons and daughters, who are so much "better"—of so much more importance—than fowls and flowers.

There are other and very beautiful recognitions in the bible, that nature teaches the existence and character of God. "The heavens declare the glory of god; and the firmament showeth His handy work." Creation teaches "even His eternal power and godhead, so that they are without excuse," who do not know Him. "The eyes of all wait upon Thee: and Thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest Thy hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing."

Miserable world has this ever been because of the conventional religions which have ever prevailed in it! Every religion is conventional, contemptibly conventional, that over-rides reason with authority and finds its foundation in books or in anything else than nature. The hanging and burning of thousands upon thousands of innocent women charged with witchcraft; the burning of the intellectual, pure and brave Servetus, at the especial instance of the learned but bigoted Calvin; the Inquisition with its three or four hundred thousand victims—all these came from ignorantly and superstitiously substituting for the study and guidance of unerring nature misleading books and traditions—in other [illegible] God's word. [illegible], which, so long, ruled our land, [illegible] authority religion —[illegible] blood the [illegible] and [illegible], and adhere to the last [illegible] Nature could never be [illegible] into the approval of such a religion. Books and traditions easily can be. So too, the rum religion, which now rules our land, drenching it with tears and blood, defies and outrages nature, instead of falling in with it. Her bosom is exuberant to the end that food may not be scarce to the mouths of the poor. But the rum religion starves the poor. No small share of its professors, in addition to casting their votes on the side of the dramshop, yield up the products of their fields to the demands of that devourer and murderer. And such professors, along with other professors who are steeped in various other iniquities, flatter themselves that they are christians; and find, as they believe, justification in their authoritative books and traditions for stigmatizing as infidels those, who hold religion to be a life rather than a letter, and character instead of creeds to be its supreme test.

An authority religion, heeding none of the remonstrances of reason and closing its ears to all pleas for mercy; its bigoted disciples with their huge quivers filled with the arrows of all manner of persecutions; and its fanatical and frenzied disciples striding over the earth with fire and sword—such is the religion, that has ever been the great scourge of mankind. But christendom is confident that it will never again be such within *her* borders. Groundless confidence! Only let the progress of science be arrested, and the lights, which it, far more than an authority religion, has kindled along the upward way of our civilization, become dim, and, very soon, in all the length and breadth of christendom, would the civil government again become subordinate to the ecclesiastical; and, here and there, inquisitions, *auto-de-fes*, martyr-stakes, and burnings and hangings for witchcraft and other fanciful crimes would re-appear. We often hear it said that the church saves the world. This would be well said were the religion of the church founded in nature—but, as the case stands, the common sense and science in the world are needed to save both the world and the church. The particular authority religion, which would work this sad change in christendom to which I have referred, might be the Catholic or Presbyterian or Methodist or some other. That it would be mainly accomplished by one of the sects can hardly be doubted, since, in the retrograding of science and the deepening darkness of ignorance, one of the sects would be like to swallow up all the others. That the present sectarian religions of christendom have not absolute sway over her is because, instead of being one with each other, they are all more or less antagonistic to each other. Infinite debtor to science is christendom, if it be only that from the freedom of opinion, which science has obtained for her, so great a multiplication of religious sects has resulted. Admit that this multiplication is in itself a great evil. Nevertheless, it has protected her from an immeasurably greater evil—from the overshadowing despotism of some single, dominant, all-absorbing sect. But however true it is, that the freedom of opinion, begotten of science, has led to the multiplying of the types and sects of this authority or book religion, it must not be forgotten that such religion and science are the enemies of each other. Is this mutual enmity denied?—and denied on the ground that sectarian churches abound where there is most science? The answer is that such of these churches, as are most imbued with science, are the least bound by an authority religion and are the first to throw it off entirely. It is not possible that science can be on good terms with any other religion than that of nature and reason.

I often inquire of myself whether such large and liberal-minded preachers as Beecher, Bellows and Chapin—such earnest and able preachers of the Christ Religion—of that true, and only true, religion of doing as we would be done by—will not, ere they die, warn the world against longer submitting to the yoke of an authority or book religion, and against longer closing its eyes to the matchless evils, which have ever come from such a religion; which still come from it; and which may yet come from it more overwhelmingly than ever. It not unfrequently occurs to me that, when I shall depart from the world, I shall leave nothing in it whose continued existence I shall so much deplore as that of its authority or book religions. It is true that I shall leave slavery and alcoholic drinks to keep on tormenting and debasing my fellow men. But very great as are these evils, still greater is the evil of these religions, which, because they are man-made, can ever be easily interpreted to justify slavery or drunkenness or any other abomination. And worst of all in these religions is their withdrawing the great questions of life from the unerring tribunal of nature; and their arrogating the exclusive right to solve by their superstition-saturated creeds and conventionalisms problems the solution of which belongs alone to reason.

I loathe this authority of which I have been speaking;—not the authority, which reason requires me to submit to; not the authority of the learned astronomer's calculations; not the authority of the captain, who bids the doing of this or that to save the ship; not the authority, which tells the wasted patient to trust his skillful and faithful physician and take his prescriptions. The authority I loathe is that which insults and defies reason and nature;—which demands the stifling of the one and refuses to acknowledge God's plain teachings in the other! In a word, the authority I loathe is that, which impudently substitutes its own dicta for the lessons of nature and the conclusions of reason.

(GERRIT SMITH, WAS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE CONVENTION.)

ADDRESS OF THE CONVENTION OF THE NEW YORK ANTI-DRAMSHOP PARTY,

Held in the City of Syracuse, August 17th, 1870,

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

More than thirty years ago, a political party was organized against American Slavery. The movement was very generally condemned. They, who found no other fault with it, still thought it to be too early. The old political parties were especially unprepared to welcome its disturbing influences. Nevertheless, it was afterwards, most abundantly and painfully seen, that the movement, instead of having been at all too early, was far and fatally too late. Slavery had grown to be so great, and its ubiquitous power had become so all controlling, that the voters could not be enabled to put it to a peaceful death. It had to go out in blood.

So, too, is our organizing to suppress dramselling said to be too early. Is it before the Republican and Democratic parties are ready for it? Nevertheless, there is much reason to fear that now, also, is an instance in which a great and vital movement has been undertaken too late. When we see how successful the dramshop parties are in holding back their members from coming to us, we feel how great was the mistake to delay this undertaking so long. When we see that the drunkards of our nation have increased to the frightful number of a million, that fifty thousand of our youth join them yearly; that dramshops are rapidly multiplying; and that in the cities of New York and Brooklyn alone, where a dramshop murder occurs as often, on an average, as every day, there are already as many as twelve or fifteen thousand of these manufactories of madmen, murderers, incendiaries and paupers: when our eyes look upon all this, we fear, not that we are too early, but too late, in organizing a political party to shut up these horrible hells. When we see that in a single city hundreds of millions are invested in the liquor traffic, and that the liquor dealers' leagues extend all over the country, and bind their members to do their utmost, and at whatever expenditure of time and money, to keep out of civil office every person, "who is," to use their precise language, "in any way disposed toward the total abstinence cause;" and every person, who does not declare himself openly against this temperance movement;" "to patronize only such business men as will join hand in hand with us;" and, in still other of their numerous like words "to deprive the political and puritanical temperance men of the power they have so long exercised in the councils of the political parties of this country;" and when we further see that the frequenters of dramshops have become so numerous, as to make it the interest of demagogues to adapt the type of their politics and candidates to the taste and character of this, the most vicious and dangerous element in our voting population; and that, in this wise, the dramshops of our drunken cities have already come to rule the politics not only of the cities, but also of the States of whose populations the cities already comprise such dangerously disproportionate and dominant shares; and when we still further see that the people and even the churches are, as a general thing, fast asleep over this rapid working of the political and moral, material and spiritual ruin of our country, we confess that our fears run high that we are too late in our attempt to stem this ever swelling torrent, and to counterwork and overcome these mighty agencies of evil. Well may we fear that the dramshop, with its numerous and powerful interests and auxiliaries, has become too strong for us. Highest of all do our fears run when we see that even the temperance societies are all, more or less, soundly asleep over this swift-advancing destruction. Surely, surely, no temperance men are awake to it, who can still consent to remain in their dramshop party, be it the Republican or the Democratic. The idea of remaining inside these parties and yet being able to work against the dramshop, is nonsensical to the last degree. It is not less absurd than would be the idea of going into hell to work for heaven. Both of these parties license the dramshop, and neither of them has ever proposed to dispense with it. Both of them believe that they have their life in the dramshop. Nevertheless, only a few weeks ago, it was held in a Meeting of the New York State Temperance Society, which Society, by the way, is little else than a branch of the Republican party, that the party would, at its approaching N. Y. State Nominating Convention, take ground, acceptable to temperance men. Acceptable it might be to sham temperance men—but most certainly not to real temperance men! What, however, if it should, by an infinitely strange possibility, be the *true* ground—in other words, be opposition to the dramshop?—to whom would belong the credit for the party's taking it?—to the but nominal temperance men, who have no principle against remaining in a dramshop party and therefore no power against the dramshop or for the earnest temperance men, who stand outside of it and press it with the claims of truth and righteousness? We do not deny that the Convention in question may speak some temperance words. But if it shall, it will be only to gull credulous temperance men. In pursuing this cunning policy, the Republican party would but prove itself to be the legitimate successor of the old Whig party, whose practice was to speak hollow abolition words for the sake of catching solid abolition votes. The Republican party will not come out against the dramshop. The Whig party refused to become an Anti-Slavery party. It broke up, and most of its members went into the Anti-Slavery party—for such, though not fully so, the Republican party was. The party now refuses to become an Anti-Dramshop party—It will, however, break up, and most of its members will come out against the dramshop. The danger is that it will delay this high duty until the dramshop degeneration and destruction of our country shall be irretrievable. The Whig party did not break up soon enough to save the country from the last and worst blows of slavery;—and it ill to be feared that the Republican party will not break up in time to save the country from sinking into the final and fatal depths and miseries of drunkenness.—Republicans are continually accusing the Democratic party of having the larger share of the drunkards:—and yet they are so blind, as not to see that the only way to kill that party is to kill the dramshop.

In the light of the fact that even temperance men are so deluded, as to remain in dramshop parties, and hope for the conversion of them into anti-dramshop parties, is it not entirely reasonable to fear that our ballot-box war upon the dramshop comes too late to be successful? Their voting against it, whilst yet talking for it, made a large proportion of the professed friends of the abolition cause, its worst enemies. In this wise, and to no less extent, does the temperance cause suffer. A foe in a friend is the worst of all foes.

Many professed temperance men who eschew our anti-dramshop party and cling to their dramshop party, propose to have Government leave it optional with each town or county, whether there shall or shall not be dramshops in it. This shows that they have not yet come to see the deep and destructive wickedness of dramselling, and that it should be numbered with crimes, if not indeed with the highest crimes. They would have no such option allowed in the case of theft, forgery or perjury, though these crimes, in the comparison of their effects with the effects of dramselling, shrink into mere peccadilloes. Why then would they not have Government forbid unconditionally, everywhere, within its jurisdiction, dramselling also? They, who deny that the protection of person and property is the sole office of Government, do, nevertheless, admit that such protection *is* its *chief* office:—and where is there a right-minded man, who does not admit that the dramshop, more than all things else put together, curtails person and property? Moreover, in this admitted fact is the justification, nay the absolute necessity for organizing the Anti-dramshop party is seen. It was not organized on the false ground, that Government is bound to espouse moral and religious reforms, but solely on the true ground, that it is bound to protect person and property.

We lament that the friends of temperance cannot agree to limit their political way upon into stopping it like to the retailing of them. We would exert our moral influence against families' making even an annual or a biennial wine

[illegible] should be endured.

[illegible]quit that boundless evils have come from the manufacture and importation of alcohol;—evils, by the way, that would have been comparatively small, had there been no dramshops. But for these outlets, both the manufacture and the importation would have been little, compared with what they have been. The motive to pour into the fountain-head becomes small, when the chief streams run, if are closed. It will doubtless, however, be a very long time ere the manufacture of alcohol, either in the family or upon a larger scale, will be surrendered or interdicted—[illegible] as a leverage out of the question, there still remain various and vast uses for it, [illegible] of which already to be innocent and indispensable. How long, too, will it be before the General Government will realize the plea for [illegible] prohibiting the continued importation of alcoholic liquors, especially such liquors as are held to be highly beneficial in cases of sickness and infirmity? Possibly, there may be no valuable medicinal properties in port wine. Nevertheless, another century will hardly see the end of importing it [illegible] passed for it.

Let us not embarrass our young and, therefore, feeble enterprise by attempting too much, and, hence, making it but too probable that we accomplish nothing. Above all, let us not, at this stage, attack any thing, which can, in any of its aspects, be reasonably or even plausibly defended. For the dramshop, no argument nor even semblance of argument can be offered. Moreover, all the candid confess that the dramshop is the great evil, and that it is this which makes the vast majority of the drunkards.

Many however contend that, were the dramshop suppressed, other ways for creating and supplying the drunkard's appetite would take its place. They reason very badly, who say that to go no farther than to stop public dramselling would be to leave private homes to be turned into private dramshops. The far better reasoning is, that such an improvement in the sentiments and habits of the people, as shall close the dramshop, will operate not to the increase, but to the diminution of liquor-drinking in families and every where else. Much more of this perilous and sinful drinking usage is there in a neighborhood of dramshops than in a neighborhood purged of them. Our Anti-dramshop party, as its name so clearly and happily imports, attacks the great evil, and that only. It will, certainly, conquer it, if the temperance men will, instead of hindering us with their criticisms and cavils, give us their generous and hearty help. Let them join the party, and scores of thousands of persons, who are still foolish enough to drink liquor, but who are not willing to have their sons brought up under the influence of the dramshop and who do not like the riots and murders, which so naturally result from the dramshop, will also join it. We pass on to ask if, when the dramshop is closed, and there shall seem further need of wielding our political power against alcohol, such wielding will be made more difficult by the fact that the dramshop is out of the way? Do not all see that it will be made much more easy and much more probably successful?

The question as to what drinks we make political war upon, continues to be asked. Our reply, as ever before, is, intoxicating or crazing drinks, and such only. The drinks, which craze or madden, make the dramshop sale of them too great a peril to person and property for Government to permit. Drinks which but dull or stupefy, Government has no more right to prohibit than the gluttony which has this effect. We add, that in every prosecution for dramselling, it should be left to the jury to decide whether the drinks in question were such as have power to craze or madden.

[illegible] Government [illegible] apply that the [illegible] nothing is to get the [illegible] as it would people by shutting up its dramshops. A drunken people are not more ready to see what [illegible] forms they need. Let every advocate of [illegible] cause [illegible] himself with [illegible] question that [illegible] people are blinded by drunkenness, the more they will appreciate the merits of such [illegible] In proportion [illegible] ing as what [illegible] hurs, and the better [illegible] than for what is [illegible] Then in the [illegible] nothing so much in the way of their [illegible] as the darkening influence of the dramshops; and nothing so essential to such success as the light which [illegible] sobriety and from the virtues attendant upon [illegible] How foolish is woman and in laboring men to have the dramshops to be multiplying until woman and the laboring man shall get their rights! The more these hindrances to all good are multiplied, the more, distant, manifestly, is the obtainment of these rights. Let then the advocates of all good reforms continue to labor for them. But, by all means, they should, labor simultaneously for the overthrow of the dramshop—in other words for the removal of the greatest obstacle in the way of those reforms. The overthrow of the dramshop should be regarded as preliminary to every other good work and therefore all workers for good should unite to accomplish it.

It is time to draw our address to a close. Dark as are our skies, the little light that is in them, is sufficient to sustain our hopes. Although this great delay in organizing a political party against dramselling has given time to the matchless and hoary evil to strike its roots so deep and wide, as to embolden it to defy extirpation, we nevertheless do not despair of success. Painful as it is to see so great numbers of the professed friends of temperance prefer remaining in their dramshop parties to uniting with us against the dramshop, we, nevertheless, do not allow the shameless inconsistency to discourage us. Knowing as we do, and as do all right-minded men, that the cause in which we are engaged is the cause of truth, of humanity and heaven, and that the salvation of our country turns upon its success, we shall, with the Divine help, continue to serve it fearlessly, faithfully and hopefully, however false to this dear cause thousands and tens of thousands of its professed friends may prove, and however determined and devilish may be its foes.

We have put in nomination the following persons—viz:

MYRON H. CLARK, of Ontario,.....FOR GOVERNOR,
CHARLES C. LEIGH, of New York,.....LIEUT. GOVERNOR.
JAMES H. BRONSON, of Montgomery,.....COMPTROLLER.
H. WILCOX, of Tompkins,.....INSP. OF STATE PRISONS.
JOHN B. EDWARDS, of Oswego,.....CANAL COMMISSIONER.
W. W. DOWD, of Washington,.....CANAL COMMISSIONER.

If some of our candidates are not amongst the conspicuous men of the State, they are, notwithstanding, all men of sound sense and undoubted integrity. We do not expect that they will be elected—for, yet awhile, the dramshop will continue to be in the ascendant. We would, however, that no one shall, for this reason, forbear giving his vote to our candidates. Never so much as in its early days, does a good cause need help. A vote for it in its despised feeble infancy is worth much more than a vote for it when it has grown into strength and into the public favor. Let no friend of our Anti-dramshop party think that he shall be expressing too much interest in it, if he walks half a dozen miles to cast his vote for it.

NEW YORK STATE ANTI-SECRET SOCIETY CONVENTION.

HELD IN SYRACUSE 15th, 16th, 17th NOVEMBER 1870.

30

GERRIT SMITH *did not come into the Convention until the afternoon of its second day. In answer to calls from all parts of the hall, he came forward and spoke as follows:*

I am here not to take an active or prominent part in your Convention. At the age of 73 I find myself too old to do so. Moreover, my health is feeble, and my voice, as you see, fails me. I have ever been interested in reforms. I am interested in this important reform which has brought you together—but I must not allow my interest in it to extend so far, as to impose additional burdens upon my old age.

I am here simply to add my testimony to yours against secret societies. One of the habits of my life has been free utterances against great public wrongs. Hence, nearly the whole of my adult years have been a standing testimony against such wrongs as imprisonment for debt, slavery, dram-selling, land-monopoly, war, secret societies, and the injustice done to woman. I hardly need add that, consequently, my life has been a toiling uphill with minorities, which very rarely became majorities, and which, indeed, very rarely, ceased to grow derision, contempt and hatred.

My chief objection to secret societies is that their feature of secrecy gives them an undue and fearful advantage over outsiders. They can see what outsiders are designing and doing;—but outsiders cannot see what they are designing and doing. The genius of our American institutions calls for equal rights—in other words, for equality all around. But to have equality all around, there must, necessarily, be openness all around. When men find themselves in the hands of a despot, it may be entirely proper for them to plot in secret against him. But, here, in this land of liberty and equal rights, there can be no justification for any plotting against each other. Is it said that those who join our secret societies are too virtuous and just to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by their secret tie to wrong outsiders? If they are so, then, indeed, how painful the evidence that a secret fraternity has the power to transform virtuous and just persons who join it, into criminals, ay even into murderers! Masons murdered Morgan. Alas, that horrid murder! Although it is between 44 and 45 years since it was perpetrated, it seems as fresh in my memory, as if it had taken place but a year ago. As often as I pass the Canandaigua jail—that jail, which masonry-infatuated men used so freely to facilitate their murderous scheme—I am thrilled with horror, and my opposition to secret societies becomes more intense. I am aware it is said that only a few, and these the least respectable, of the members of the masonic society, had a part in the murder of Morgan. But it was manifest that hundreds, and amongst them the most respectable citizens, had a more or less direct part in it. It was the crime not of one lodge only, but of a wide plurality of lodges. The truth is that masonry was aroused to bloody vengeance. It civilized its disciples. Its laws called for murder: and its disciples were trained to regard these laws as paramount to all other human laws, and, indeed, as more sacred and obligatory than all the laws of heaven.

Masonry murdered Morgan. If it could not conceal his murderers, it, nevertheless, protected them. It overrode the laws of the land and ruled the courts and the ballot-boxes. Moreover, it is capable of repeating its crimes. Why then should we not dread secret societies, and do what we can to bring them to an end? It is true that several persons were convicted of the steps they took in the Morgan murder. But no one was convicted of actually murdering him—of giving him the finishing blow. Then, too, the punishment, which followed the convictions, was slight—generally but a few months imprisonment, and in no instance more than 2 1-3 years. Nor must we forget that their masonic brothers made martyrs of the prisoners, and supplied them with luxurious living during all their confinement. Even ladies vied with each other in honoring and feasting them. Slavery had so debauched the public sentiment of the South that her ladies presented canes to the wretched man, who had sought to assassinate Charles Sumner, that noble champion of Freedom. And masonry had so debauched the public sentiment of the North that her ladies were eager to honor and feast masonic murderers.

But has not masonry repented of the murder of poor Morgan, and expelled from her fellowship his murderers? She has not expelled one of them—but, on the contrary, she has honored and promoted many of them.

We who, at the time of the murder of Morgan, had reached manhood, are much to be blamed for having suffered the agitation against masonry to subside and pass away. It is true that, ere we did so, the masonic lodges had generally surrendered their charters and the people generally become sick of the consensical and wicked ceremonies, the horrid and blasphemous oaths and imprecations, of masonry. Just here, let me say that it is quite idle to pretend that the people were ignorant of the secrets of masonry. There is no such thing as evidence and no such thing as certainty, if, after the concurrent revelations made by thousands of seceding masons, it is not evident to the public, nay an absolute certainty, what are the secrets of masonry. We should have kept up the agitation against masonry as long as a single lodge remained to imperil life, to control the ballot-boxes, and to override the laws and the courts. As the king, referred to in the Scriptures, stopped smiting the ground too soon, so, also, did we stop too soon our smiting of secret societies. Like that king we smote and "stayed." We should have kept on smiting until these societies were all "consumed." Had we continued this agitation, masonry would, ere long, have been in bad odor throughout the land, and tens of thousands of our beloved youth, who, because we suffered them to fall into ignorance of its character, connected themselves with masonry, would have been withheld from the bad connexion.

We who wronged you by this unfaithfulness, will, probably, not live to see the end of masonry and of other secret societies. But you, who are young and you who are middle aged, will, if you do your duty and work "arm and soul" for the overthrow of these abominations, witness the end of them. By the way, woman, who is soon to be a greater power in our land than she has been, will come to your help and will work with you for the extinction of these secret societies, which by excluding her, insult her. Greatly does woman suffer from these societies. Greatly, too, does she suffer from these somewhat kindred associations called clubs, which, like secret societies, are composed exclusively of men. The excitements of these clubs make tame and insipid the sweet and healthful enjoyments of the family fireside; and thus do they wean from their wives and children thousands of husbands and fathers.

The Church, whose blessed founder did nothing in secret but every thing openly, will surely come to your help—for she will surely see that it is most unseemly to have her members members also of a society whose deeds are those of secrecy, darkness and concealment. It cannot be that this attempt to blend the religion, whose yea is simply yea and whose nay is simply nay, with a religion (if religion it may be called) of horrifying oaths and imprecations, will much longer continue.

And, then, may we not hope that there will, soon, be added to our long roll of opponents of secret societies many, who are now in them, but who are sick of having entered them?

In the midst, however, of my speaking against secret societies, let me inculcate the duty of our passing none other

[illegible] of their benevolence [illegible] to their own members, and they [illegible] Mutual Insurance Companies than Benevolent Societies. The boastful argument that [illegible] is, [illegible], known to make friends of foes, rising above even national enmities, and, by force of its mystic tie, bringing into friendship with each other soldiers of contending [illegible], is, after all, an argument against Masonry. The benevolence, which interferes with what is due to country, is unprincipled and spurious. The natural claims of the human brotherhood are disparaged by setting above them the conventional claims of an oath-bound portion of it. The good we do each other we should [illegible] as members of the whole human family.

I close with saying that we have reached an age of the world to which these secret and exclusive societies are emphatically unsuited, and from which they should rapidly pass away. These societies are composed of men, who forsake the human brotherhood, and, to a remarkable extent, confine their sympathies and fellowship to one another. Now, the age, in which it is our happiness to live, is one which calls for the solidarity and oneness—the cordially recognized solidarity and oneness—of all human beings. The simple, sweet and sore [illegible]ion, preached by Jesus, is fast coming to be preached, [illegible] earth over. True, it is not, every where, preached in his name. But its essence is preached as well by Chunder Sen of Hindostan, as by Spurgeon of England, Father Hyacinth of France, Beecher, Bellows, Bishop Simpson and Father Hecker of America. This only true religion, which [illegible] and other hundred [illegible] to [illegible] and [illegible] human [illegible] together. But the [illegible] societies go to part them from each other, and to build impassable barriers across the human brotherhood. In this religion there is neither male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus. Masonry, on the [illegible], shuts out [illegible]—and well it may shut her out from witnessing its horrid oaths and indecent and blasphemous ceremonies. Which, my hearers, shall we choose for our portion? I say which?—for we cannot choose both. We cannot choose both, for they are opposites. The one excludes the other. May God help us to make a wise choice!

In obedience to the unanimous request of the Convention, Mr. Smith's remarks were written out for the press.

The Resolutions, which Mr. Smith presented to the Convention, on leaving it the next morning, are the following:

First. Resolved, That in the light of the fact that Masonry holds her laws to be paramount to all other laws, and that in the light of the further fact, that they are made, not in behalf of the right, but in behalf of Masons right or wrong, it is clearly proper in every suit between one who is, and one who is not a Mason, to call in question the impartiality and credibility of Masonic witnesses, and also to insist on the exclusion of Masons from the Jury-box.

Second. Resolved, That in the light of the fact that Masonry murdered Morgan, and in the light of the further fact that it succeeded in baffling all attempts to punish the crime, we are forbidden, by our respect both for Divine and Human laws, to clothe with civil office any of the adherents or upholders of Masonry.

A MUTUAL DISAPPOINTMENT!

To the Anti-dramshop Party,

You were disappointed when you saw me favoring, in the recent political canvass, the Republican party. You were disappointed when you saw this in one, who had ever been pitying as deluded, or censuring as heartless, the professed temperance men who go along with the anti-temperance political parties. On the other hand, I was disappointed when I saw some of you going with the Democratic party. I ought not however to have been surprised at seeing those who had come from that party, returning to it, nor at seeing another class drawn to it by the name of an eminent journalist, who had for many years, been their chief political educator. Then, too, I was disappointed in seeing not a few of you going to the Prohibition party. Less surprised, however, should I have been at this than at the other disappointment. For this party, like your own, is made up of sincere and earnest friends of temperance. Moreover, it had able and good men for its candidates for President and Vice-President. No just man, who knows them, can fail to hold in high esteem both James Black and John Russell.

On the other hand, you should not have been surprised at seeing me step aside from the Anti-dramshop party to work with the Republicans against the return of the Democratic party to power. Counting in the time in which my abolition heart was misled by the plausibilities of the Colonization scheme, I had toiled in the cause of the black man for far more than forty years. In all these years the most dreaded opponent of this cause was, next to the Devil, the Democratic party. Indeed, the Devil himself could hardly have been more devilish toward the black man than was this Democratic party. On the other hand, the Republican party had proved itself to be the black man's great benefactor. It had broken his chains; and, amongst the the other blessings it had given him, is the priceless ballot. When, then, I saw, in the late canvass, the new and alarming expedient of the Democratic party for getting itself again into power, what wonder that I should drop all else, even the Anti-dramshop work, and hasten to the rescue of the black man! Of course, I mean by this expedient the taking up of a highly intelligent and influential republican, *seemingly* for the new leader of the Democratic party, but *simply* to be nothing else than its figure-head. The party had not the least thought of being led by Mr. Greeley any farther than he should consent to be led by it. The use of his name was merely to draw off disappointed, restless and credulous republicans. Not one doubt had I that the Democratic party was *feigning* repentance and righteousness, and that its success in the Election would result in the restoration of "the white man's government," and the casting again of the black man under the feet of the white man. Not one doubt had I, whenever I heard it said that the Democratic party was dead, and had accepted its death meekly and sweetly, that this old rogue was but "playing 'possum" and pretending death; and that, on the first occasion for it, it would wake up again to its old wicked life and old wicked work. And, surely, if I had had one doubt of all this, it would have been instantly dispelled by the minority report on Kukluxism presented to Congress, and welcomed by all the Democratic members. Bear in mind that it was presented a little after the Cincinnati Convention and a little before the Baltimore Convention. This report, overflowing with murderous hate of the black man, and looking complacently, and wishfully to his expulsion and even extermination, doubtless expressed the feeling toward him of well-nigh the whole Democratic party; and proved that it did not mean to reverse its infernal policy toward him by accepting Mr. Greeley and the deceptive platform which accompanied his nomination. Very significant facts to this end are that Mr. Blair, who, probably, did quite as much as any other member of the Cincinnati Convention to bring about the nomination of Mr. Greeley, was the first of the eight signers of this accursed report, and that Mr. Bayard, who spoke so vigorously for Mr. Greeley in the Baltimore Convention, was the next of these signers.

The wide-spread and incessant complaint that it is uncharitable to doubt the genuineness of this warmly professed repentance of the Democratic party is unreasonable. Suppose we allow that it is possible, or even probable, that, on a certain day or night last July, repentance seized this wicked party, and turned it, in sorrow and disgust, from its hideous crimes of forty years against the black man—are we at all inconsistent, if we require the proofs, which time,—yes, and a long time too—can alone afford of the reality of its repentance and the sincerity of its professions? If an old thief tells us that he has, at last, repented, it is surely enough on our part *to hope* that it is so. It would be charity-too-mad, were we to put our goods into his hands for safe-keeping, ere we had put him on probation and required him to "bring forth fruits meet for repentance." And shall we, on the strength of its bare professions, put into the hands of the Democratic party this great nation, which only so recently it had come so near destroying? Above all, shall we take the black man out of the friendly and safe hands of the Republican party, and put him into hands still wet with his blood? God forbid!

Let me here say that, whilst I thought thus unfavorably of the Democratic party, I did not forget that many wise and honest men thought otherwise. Nevertheless, it was my duty to judge and act in my own light, and not in what I believed to be their darkness. How, then, could I do less than go with the Republican party—at least so far, as to vote for its principal candidates? I did so during the Rebellion: and I did so then, as I do now, for the purpose of helping to save the black man and the country. To have failed of doing so, either then or now, would have brought me under a load of self-condemnation too heavy to be borne.

To return from this digression—I flattered myself that, after this exciting and absorbing Election had gone by, the members of the Anti-dramshop party would resume their suspended work. But, alas, its only editor has proclaimed its death, and given up his Paper to be edited by a Prohibitionist! Hence, in addressing this letter to the Anti-dramshop party, I expose myself to the imputation of speaking to the dead rather than to the living.

It was my hope that this party would live and grow and continue to press the Republican party with increasing and ultimately successful force to put an end to dramselling. But I now see, more clearly than before, that I had no right to hope for any but a very distant success of the Anti-dramshop party. Indeed, I now number amongst the many errors of my life my going to Chicago in 1869 with the hope of impressing upon the National Temperance Convention the peculiar, or at least not common, views of the office of Civil Government, which I had cherished and advocated for many years. It is true, that the Convention adopted my Address; but the platform it adopted (of which, it is not true, that I wrote a part) was, in some essential respects, at war with the Address, as was also the name, which the Convention finally chose for the new party. I ought to have seen, that these peculiar views, which, to some extent, I embodied in the Address, and which, to the like extent were subsequently adopted by the New York State Anti-dramshop party, would, for probably a long time to come, be held by only a very small part of the people. They will yet prevail: but not until there shall have been a great revolution in the popular ideas of Government.

The office of Government is simply to protect person and property. Nor is it to protect even these from all conceivable perils, remote as well as near, constructive and possible as well as literal and certain. In the lax sentiments of many a book, which Government must not presume to suppress, lie germs of danger to great essential rights. So, too, the drinking of intoxicating beverages is always fraught with more or less present or prospective peril to the public safety. Nevertheless, I would not have Government invade the rights of families and individuals so far as to forbid all such drinking. The true rule is to allow the individual and the family to do what they please, short of palpably encroaching on the public safety and on the rights of the people. But the dramshop is such an encroachment:—and since it supplies no need, provides no comfort, and is an unmixed evil, there is not the least reason, nor even a decent excuse, for its existence. Its attractions render it the superlative public danger. For, by force of these attractions, it becomes the great manufactory of paupers, incendiaries, madmen and murderers. Whilst, then, I cannot go with the Absolute Prohibitionists and invoke the power of Government against all traffic in intoxicating drinks and against even the housewife's making her keg of currant or raspberry wine, I deem myself in no wise inconsistent, and in no degree a trespasser on the individual or home rights reserved from the domain of Government, when I continue to vote for the suppression of dramselling. How entirely reasonable was the Anti dramshop party! It called on Government to do its part of the great temperance work by protecting person and property from the ravages of dramselling, and left it to moral suasion to do the remainder. This remainder would be comparatively small. For the ending of liquor-hotels, liquor saloons and all other drink-dens,

...r Intemperance. By the way, is there not a few persons left to revive the Anti-dramshop party, and to keep its truths and testimonies before the public mind until, by the help of more light, they shall gain a hospitable entrance? That little party is still as dear to me, as it was before it was taken away from me. I am as willing to give money toward reviving it, as I was to give money toward instituting it:—but the work to this end must be performed by younger persons. Much has the cause of temperance cost me during the nearly fifty years in which I have labored for it; and I still love it too well to refuse it further aid, or to refuse further aid to that little prostrate party, which, though proposing to serve that precious cause only incidentally, was nevertheless adapted to serve it very effectively.

It is not a little painful to me to refuse to fall in with the Prohibition party—for in it are the friends of temperance; and against it are the foes of temperance. Moreover, its being an independent party, and opposed to voting with the rum parties, commends it to my warm regards. For, yet a while, the friends of temperance, in order to work advantageously for their cause, must work in a party by themselves. In this wise, they will be able to do far more to reform a rum party than by working in it. Notwithstanding, however, all the credit due to the Prohibition party, I must continue to stand outside of it. For a year or more after its organization in 1869, I continued to hope that it would adopt the principles and policy of the Anti-dramshop party. But their theories were too wide apart too justify such hope.

I believe that the Prohibition party will fail—first, because its object—absolute prohibition by law—will be found to be unattainable, and, second, because it ought not to be attainable. I admit that such prohibition may, perhaps, be reached in a few of the States: but, I do not believe, that it will be permanent in any of them. My chief reason for holding that such prohibition should not be enacted is that it exceeds the legitimate powers of Government, and trenches on rights not conceded to Government but reserved by the people. Let Government have free play every where within its own bounds: but let its attempted invasion, at whatever point, of the exclusive and sacred province of individuality and home be sternly repelled. To protect that province—not to invade it—is the proper work of Government. Indeed, that is the best administered Government, which permits and secures the largest individual and home liberty; and that is the worst which goes farthest in dwarfing its subjects by usurping their reserved rights. Hence, there should be no toleration of sumptuary laws; nor should Government be allowed to take the work of moral reform out of the hands of the people. It does not surprise me to find that the Prohibition party has become so clamorous for Sabbath legislation, and so frantic in its appeals to the superstitions and bigoted for the protection of the popular Sabbath. The tyranny of such legislation is of a piece with the tyranny of law-ordained Absolute Prohibition. Both trample on human freedom; and each is a step on the road to the now widely-sought-for incorporation of a religious creed in the Federal Constitution. If we would stay our steps toward a despotism, and transmit to posterity the fulness of republican freedom, we should hasten to repeal our Sabbath laws and all other laws, which interfere with the freedom of conscience and opinion. What an outrage upon such freedom in the person of the Jew and the Seventh-day-baptist is the law, which makes Sunday the Sabbath! What an outrage upon such freedom in the person of him, who regards no day as more holy than any other day, is the law which forbids his own chosen and innocent use of every day! The plea that our nation is, by its Constitution, a christian nation, and that all its people are therefore bound to conform to christian usages, is one that only ignorance or dishonesty can offer. I would not utter a word in disparagement of the Sabbath. I fully believe that the Divine blessing rests upon it, as it does upon the observance of all the laws of our being. This blessing, however, is not upon a compelled or arbitrary Sabbath, but only upon a free and voluntary one. The Temperance reform is the last reform, which can afford to be prosecuted in the spirit of a superstitious and intolerant religion. Such a religion has not brought success to our efforts for temperance, nor will it ever bring success to them. The only religion, which can serve the cause of temperance, is one, that aims to keep pace with science and to be guided by reason.

It does not surprise me that reformers should, in behalf of their cherished reforms, demand more help from Government than it can legitimately afford. Especially free from such surprise am I when the reformers are they who are intent on saving this land, and the whole world from the matchless curse of intemperance. Not strange is it that, in their eagerness for success, they do not pause to consider more carefully how far they may go and no farther, without trespassing on rights and interests as vital and precious as those they are themselves serving. The work of Government is to hold its shield over all rights and all interests: and none of them are safe unless the shield be held impartially over them all. If Government should be induced to favor the temperance reform at the expense of other valid claims upon its care and countenance, even that reform would, in the end, suffer loss however great and ... Government at its best kept impartial and within its proper limits, as public right, how ever clear and commanding, is safe.

Of course, I expect no good at the hands of the Democratic party—the party, which, though in its earlier years the reform party and emphatically the people's party, has now grown into the wickedest and worst of parties. But with increasing hope do I look to the Republican party as a reform party and as a party with which the friends of temperance can, at no distant day, consistently identify themselves. Whilst the Democratic party was its formidable rival for votes and the power of votes, it naturally hesitated to venture upon new and unpopular issues. But, now, that the Democratic party has sunk, and probably sunk forever, under the weight of its iniquities and especially of its Kuklux and other crimes against the black man, we may reasonably expect that the Republican party will be emboldened to go much farther in the line of reform than it has hitherto gone. Already, there are indications of its favoring the participation of woman in the choice of rulers. And, surely, if rulers are but the constituted guardians of person and property, woman should be allowed a voice in choosing them. For are not the rights of person and property as sacred in woman as in man? Then, too, there are, of late, cheering signs in some sections of the Republican party that, ere long, it will make concerted and open fight against dramselling. The extreme measures of the Absolute Prohibitionists it will probably never espouse. The entirely reasonable and moderate (quite sufficient though so moderate) claims of the Anti-dramshop party it would, at no distant day, have yielded to. Very lamentable is it that the Anti-dramshop party should have been put to death before its work was done. That work was to war upon dramselling until a great political party (it could be no other than the Republican party) should take up the war, and carry it on to victory. The cause of temperance! May its friends be led to serve it unitedly and wisely! By all that is precious in that dear cause; and by all that is sorrowful and heart-rending in the days and nights of the drunkard's wife and in the lives of her infinitely worse than orphaned children; and by all that is appalling in the ruin, which intemperance is fast bringing upon our country, let every friend of temperance abstain from all intoxicating drinks, and from tolerating license laws, and from connecting himself with any political party, which shelters the dramshop. Let him watch over the Republican party. Even that party is still more the friend than the foe of the dramshop.

I witnessed the beginnings of the Temperance Reform. I witnessed its rapid progress in its first few years—very rapid, because it was then full of religion and of the power of God. Those six wondrous sermons of grand old Lyman Beecher sounded its key note and ushered in its heaven-born work. I witnessed the beginnings of the decline of the Reformation. It was at, or soon after, the time of the advent of the "Washingtonian movement," and when the temperance meeting ceased to take its tone and character from the words and manners of religious and praying men, and took it from the songs and jests of coarse men calling themselves, and in many instances truly, "*reformed* drunkards." Then it was that the Reformation fell from its high plane of solemnity and power to a low plane of frivolity and weakness. As well might solemnity be dispensed with at the funeral as in the temperance meeting. Drunkenness is far more to be dreaded than death; and the way to escape drunkenness needs to be pointed out and considered quite as solemnly as the way to prepare for death.

Thus was the temperance reformation prepared to take another and a wider descending step. It took it when it went into secret societies. The bible informs us that "ancient men," who had seen the magnificence of the first temple, "wept with a loud voice" over the inferiority of the second temple. Much more reason however have "ancient men," who had a part in the prosperous early years of the temperance cause, to "weep with a loud voice" over the disgrace, and degeneracy of that once holy cause by the trumpery, paraphernalia and puerilities of those secret temperance societies.

Of all the great crimes of earth, Kukluxism—the foster-child of the Democratic party—is the greatest. Nevertheless, there is one great good, which I had hoped might come from that great evil. This great good is the wenning of the consciences and thoughtful from *all* secret societies—not only from those whose secrets are bound up in horrid and blasphemous oaths, but from those also whose secrets are protected by mild and unalarming oaths. For every secret society counterbalances every other secret society:—the least dangerous countenances the most dangerous. But, I fear, it is too late for any thing to avail against secret societies. They have been suffered to multiply in kinds and numbers until, at length, the land is shingled and re-shingled, all over, with them. They rule in the public sentiment, and oftentimes in the churches: and they are capable, whenever tempted to do so, of ruling in the courts and in politics. Secret societies and their members are now so common as to inspire no alarm. When the masons, by means of the feature of secrecy in their association, had murdered Morgan and escaped punishment (for the association proved itself to be too strong for the laws) masonry withered and, for the time, disappeared under the storm of the whole country's indignation. But, now, when, by means of the like power of secrecy, Kukluxism murders thousands, and mercilessly scourges many more thousands, the whole country is, for the most part, fast asleep to its dangers from secret societies.

Let despots and those who war on despots shroud themselves in darkness and concealments. But every secret society is at war with the genius of republicanism. That genius calls for open and impartial dealings amongst all, and every where. So too, does christianity call for it. Jesus testified: "I spake openly to the world . . . . and in secret have I said nothing"

GERRIT SMITH.

PETERBORO November 6 1872.

PETERBORO' May 1 1873.

DOCTOR FITZHUGH, Livingston Co., N. Y.,

MY DEAR KINSMAN,

You like "The Index" of Toledo, Ohio. So do I. Its vigorous reasonings and its beautiful candor and fairness make it a very attractive and useful Paper. Its leading position, however—that christianity is not the true and ultimate religion and that our duty is to stand outside of it—I cannot, as yet, fall in with.

Where shall we look to learn what is man's true religion? To man himself. If we could conceive of such an absurdity as a horse-religion, it would be of a religion suited to the horse. So, too, the religion for human nature must clearly be the one, which that nature calls for. In other words, to know what moral character and what moral life his nature calls for is to know man's true religion. Hence, he, who is the most natural of men, is the most religious of men, and that it is a mistake to say:

"Nature must count her gold but dross
If she would gain the heavenly land."

We cannot attain to that land by ignoring or disparaging nature—but by obeying and honoring her. He, who abides most steadfastly in his nature, and is most careful to meet all her demands upon him, is the best of all men, and therefore the happiest of all men. The unjust man, the merciless man, the proud man, the dissolute man, is, by force of his violated nature, an unhappy man. The debauchee and drunkard have so far perverted and debased their nature, as to be amongst the most miserable of men. And who, that sees how unhappy a creature the liar makes of himself, can doubt that his nature required him to be truthful in order to be happy? We learn both from experience and observation that men are made to be benevolent and to find their own happiness in studying and promoting the happiness of others. Hence, the deeper they sink themselves in selfishness, the deeper they sink themselves in misery. Our nature, if preserved in its original benevolence, forbids our betaking ourselves to occupations, in which we cannot benefit and bless, but in which we rather curse, mankind. He has departed from his true nature, who sells tobacco, or who, like the sham christians of the Connecticut Valley, taxes God's good earth to produce the vile weed: and he has very widely departed from it, who sells the drunkard's drink, or who grows the materials for it.

As religion is our most important concern, there is, therefore, nothing of which we need to have, and are entitled to have, such certain proof. It cannot be that our Heavenly Father has left us in necessary uncertainty as to what is the true religion. But it is nature only, that supplies us with *certain* knowledge on any subject. How unreasonable then, how unphilosophical and absurd, for him, who would study to know what is the true religion, to go away from the certainties of nature to traditions and histories! Even the best of histories are so marked with man's imperfections, that the uncertainty of history has become proverbial. "History is a lie," is a universally accepted saying.

The religion of nature is the one true religion. If christianity does not recognize this fact, then "The Index" is right in repudiating christianity.

Christianity must not be identified with the superstitions and speculations, legends and myths connected with it either in or out of the bible. It must be judged of in the light of what its great teacher taught to be its substance and essence. In this light it is the religion of love to God and love to man: and this is the very religion revealed in nature. My nature teaches me to regard my fellow-man as I regard myself, for the reason that he ranks in the scale of being with myself; and it also teaches me that we are both to love God supremely, for the reason that He is the Father of us both.

Every man, who has not so far dulled and destroyed his nature, as to render it unfit to guide him, knows the difference between moral right and moral wrong:—in other words, he is capable of distinguishing the essentially true from the essentially false religion. Christianity affirms this in Jesus' saying to the promiscuous assembly and even to those who had darkened and debased themselves by hypocrisy: "Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" And so deeply engraved upon the heart of human nature is equity, that every man, even though he have but shreds of human nature left in him, knows that he should do as he would be done by. But emphatically is this the teaching of christianity also. How obvious is the harmony—is the oneness indeed—between christianity and nature in respect to impartial goodness! The former commends to us the latter by the example of the Sun's rising upon the evil and the good and the rain's falling upon the just and the unjust. Then, again, that the sole duty of man is "to do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God" is a lesson which christianity got from judaism and judaism got from nature.

In this age when science is testing all things, a prominent objection to christianity is that it enjoins prayer, and that prayer is an unnatural absurdity. I admit that it enjoins prayer: and I hold that nothing is more natural than prayer. Indeed, so entirely natural is it that christianity, if it forbade or ignored prayer, could not be the religion of nature, and therefore could not be the true religion. Nothing is more natural than for distressful want to make supplications, and nothing is more natural than for alarmed sin, yea and for broken-hearted sin also, to pray for forgiveness. I add that nothing is more natural than for conscious weakness to praise and adore power, especially boundless power.

The absurdity of prayer is insisted on in the light of God's unchangeableness. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which it is not unreasonable to suppose that He does change, and that, in his self-adaptiveness, He is different to different persons—different on different occasions. There is a legend that the famous statue of Memnon in Egypt was so constructed as to break forth in sublime music at every rising of the Sun upon it. May we not suppose that there is a fact in the case of the true God, which matches this fancy in the case of the false one? May we not reasonably suppose that God has so constructed his temple—his universe—that "prayer ardent opens heaven?"—and that blessings, withheld from the prayerless, do, in some form or other, descend to the prayerful? Methinks that the attitude of this world toward its great and loving Father will not be entirely what it should be until all lips shall break forth in prayer and express the thankfulness, praise and supplication of all hearts.

I do not need to bolster my argument for prayer by reliance on either supernatural or special answers to prayer. I believe the answer to prayer to be as natural as the prayer, and, moreover, that the answer is as truly ordained from the beginning as is any other of the arrangements of nature. It is surely not unreasonable to suppose that, from the beginning, prayer has been made "a condition precedent" to the bestowment of many of the blessings, which come to the prayerful and, indeed, to the prayerless also. Is it said that God knows our wants without our expressing them? He does—but has He not the right to require us to express them? May he not say in the words of Ezekiel (36:37) "I will yet for this be inquired of—to do it?" God, because He is God, is necessarily different to the pure and merciful from what He is to the froward (18th Psalm)—necessarily different to the proud from what He is to the humble. He would not be God did He not resist the proud whilst giving his grace to the humble.

We must stand up for the religion of the bible—not because it is in the bible, but because it is in nature. The bible, though grandest and best of all books, yet, being the work of men, many and does contain errors. But nature is as free from errors as is He from whom it came. We should not, in our ignorance and superstition, idolize the bible and claim perfection for it. But we should prize it because it essentially agrees with nature, explains nature and enforces it. Christianity, though so much of error is mixed with it, must, in its essentials, be one with nature. Were it not so, it could not have been so largely influential in holding millions to their uncorrupted nature and in moulding them into that precious character and beautiful life, which they and they only can attain to, who are kept faithful to the claims of their God-given nature.

As I have already virtually said, their nature shows that men are made to love one another, and thus be happy in one another. But christianity, so emphatically one with nature at this point, goes so far as to declare that "love is the *fulfilling* of the law." Let us then cling to christianity and seek to purify it of its dross and of whatever, that is contrary to nature, has crept into it. For none of all these evil and spurious mixtures is Christ's religion responsible. They are to be thrown out because of their violent disagreement with its great principles and precepts.

May this sure and simple religion—this religion of nature and reason, of justice and goodness—be, my beloved friend, yours and mine and our children's. I trust that it is yours. I would there were more evidence that it is mine also—more evidence in the experiences of my heart and manifestations of my life.

Of all the men, who have walked this earth and wet it with their tears and sweat and blood, none have lived so obediently to the laws of

their being, in a word as naturally, as Jesus. Why then should we doubt that the religion he taught is *the religion of nature*?—in other words, the true religion? It is an entire mistake that the mission of Jesus was to teach a new religion, *It was to revive in the minds* and hearts of men and call forth in their lives that which, from the beginning of the world, had been the *only true religion, and that which*, to the end of the world, will be the only true religion—the religion of nature.

I repeat, why should we doubt that it was the religion of nature, which Jesus taught? He was its supreme *expositor*. He *was himself* pre-eminently the child of nature. He loved her with his whole heart —*even with a woman's love*. Her whole wealth of illustration was ever at his service; and she ever stood ready to enliven and adorn his truths and enforce his arguments. When we reflect that Jesus taught and insisted that men can receive his religion only in a child-like spirit—only, indeed, by becoming as little children, dropping their artificial and cunning life, and returning, as if by a new birth, to the naturalness, simplicity and sincerity of childhood—when I say that all this is before our mind, how can we doubt that it was the religion of nature, which he urged on the acceptance of his hearers? Especially, how can we doubt that he, who was so given to deep and fervent prayer, taught the naturalness and therefore the need of prayer?

It may be objected to my train of thought that human nature is too diverse in its different races, and, indeed, in the different individuals of the same race, to afford a uniform guide and standard in the matter of religion. But man is essentially the same every where. "As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." The only danger at this point is the mistaking of the perversions and abuses of nature for nature herself. The debauchee and drunkard must not let their evil habits decide for them what is the true religion. No sinner must let his sins do this. Every person is, in spite of the perversions and pollutions of his nature, held responsible to his nature as it was before he had perverted and polluted it. He is to be judged by and bound to conform to his original nature, however many and wide may have been his departures from it. Let him fix his eye on a nature still as pure as when it came from the hand of its Maker. Let him fix it on Jesus. Say not that Jesus was a Hebrew; had the training, the prejudices and partialities of a Hebrew; and therefore could not be a universal model. He was far more than a Hebrew. He represented all races. He was a *man*, and he lived and died for our common humanity—for our humanity, as it lies back of all races, sects and educations, all literatures and traditions.

Perhaps, I have done wrong to "The Index." For, perhaps, I have unduly magnified the differences between it and myself. This difference may be wholly in our definitions of christianity. My definition does not include its unchristian mixtures. But "The Index" includes them all in its definition and holds Christ's religion responsible for them all. Were its definition just, there would be no ground to complain of its war upon christianity. But in my view it is exceedingly, though unintentionally unjust. Christianity is what its constructive principles are. It is what these always and every where call for—nothing more, nothing less. If they call for any moral wrong, then christianity is wrong, otherwise not. These principles determine its theoretical scope and practical character; and it is unreasonable to hold it responsible for any thing which violates them. It is true that Jesus said somewhat more than sufficed to enunciate these principles—but it was only to illustrate and explain them. It was certainly not to overthrow nor invalidate them. In other words, it is not supposable that Jesus should speak against the tenor of the religion he taught—against the principles of his own religion.

Affectionately yours

GERRIT SMITH.

PETERBORO July 10th 1873.

To the gentlemen, who composed the recent two State Temperance Conventions in Albany:

If my presuming to argue with you—one person with hundreds—shall savor of egotism, I trust you will pardon much to my old age and to the fact that I have toiled nearly half a century in the cause of temperance and expended tens of thousands of dollars in it.

Alcoholic beverages work more evil in christendom than any thing else, and, perhaps, than all things else. The drunkard is the most miserable of men; his wife the most miserable of women; and their children are more to be pitied than any other children. But for these beverages the inmates of our almshouses and prisons would be few, and few would be the victims of the gallows. But for these beverages there would be safety and peace in our unhappiest families and unhappiest neighborhoods. Nor is it only when they induce drunkenness, that alcoholic beverages work this immeasurable evil. They, probably, work even more through "temperate drinkers" than through drunkards. The drunkard is but one man in a dozen or two of men; and no person trusts his judgment, or takes his advice, or puts himself under his influence. But the vast majority of the men amongst us are "temperate drinkers"; and a large share of these drinkers drink frequently, if not habitually, for the purpose of exciting themselves and of elevating the tone of their flagging spirits. What, however, is this excitement or elevation but a greater or less degree of intoxication, craziness or insanity? And yet who is afraid to take legal or medical or even spiritual advice from a "temperate drinker", or to come into the closest relations with him? Our nation is ruled, society fashioned, the church influenced by "temperate drinkers", and largely by their alcoholic inspirations.

Since, then, alcohol is not necessary, nor to any extent useful as a beverage, and since a large share of the people are much harmed by it, and no small share ruined by it, how plain is it that every one should feel bound to abstain from it as a beverage. His personal safety is a very urgent consideration to this end. The contribution of his example to the safety of others he should feel to be another, if not, indeed, more urgent one. By all that is precious in his protection from a fate more horrible and loathsome than any other fate; by all that is precious in the protection of others from it; and by all that is precious in the salvation of this great nation over which impends the Rum Ruin, no American should so much as wet his lips with alcohol unless it be prescribed by a wise physician, who dreads it as a drink. No other physician is a safe counsellor in the case. Physicians, with comparatively few exceptions, are the great enemies of temperance. He, who drinks what the Doctor prescribes, drinks freely—for he drinks upon an authority in whose presence his own judgment is distrusted and submissive, and his conscience therefore quieted. There is no great extravagance in saying that, in the making of drunkards, the doctors do not fall very far behind the dramshops.

Here, then, in what I have said, is that which every man owes to the cause of temperance. He should discharge this duty, and do what he can to persuade others to discharge it. Thus far there is, probably, no disagreement between us. But when I add that this comprises his whole duty to this great cause, you dissent from me. You hold that he is bound to endeavor to draw Government into the aid of it, whilst I, on the contrary, hold that Government is not to identify itself with the temperance reform, nor with any other moral reform. Civil Government is, by far, the most important of earthly institutions: and it is vital to all valuable interests that it be kept unperverted, and confined to its legitimate sphere. Instead of being allowed to trench upon some interests for the benefit of others, it should remain the common and impartial protector of them all. It must uphold, not alone the rights of the collective people, but the rights of the individual also; and must not be allowed to invade his rights even under the most plausible pleas and strongest assurances of advancing the public good.

The province of Government is very far from being commensurate with that of moral influence. The protection of person and property is, as all admit, its chief work: and I would that all might admit that it is its only work. Moreover, this is not *unlimited* protection—but protection only from such evils as Government alone can protect from, and as society could not long continue to exist, unless protected from. Other and controllable evils must remain to be dealt with by moral influence instead of Governmental coercion. In many a dwelling there is gambling, and in many a dwelling there is lewdness. But Government must not undertake to purge them of these evils. Society could not, however, withstand the tide of corruption, were Government to allow the vile to multiply, at pleasure, public gambling-hells and public houses of prostitution. So, too, in many a private house are alcoholic beverages. Nevertheless, Government must not search for them. Society can maintain itself against this lamentable usage of home-drinking. But it is threatened with utter destruction by the growing evil of such beverages in hotels and saloons and other dramselling places. New York reels under the incessant blows from her ten thousand licensed and unlicensed drunkard manufactories. Any material addition to their number, or any occasion, which should fire them with a fresh inspiration from hell, might serve to engulf the city in the wild waves of anarchy and ruin. New York staggers under her load of fraudulently-contracted debts—but she staggers far worse under her dramshop demoralization. Indeed, this load of debts has come mainly from this demoralization.

Dramselling is the manufacturing of madmen, incendiaries, and criminals of every grade from the petty thief to the murderer. It is, far more than all things else, the fruitful source of peril to person and property. Moreover, no candid person will hold that it is, to any extent, a public convenience, or that its suppression would, in the slightest degree, curtail individual or family rights. Hence, the first duty of Government is to strike at and extirpate the dramshop, be it the palatial or vulgar hotel, the gilded saloon or the dirtiest drink-den. And this it is to do, not at all as a temperance measure—not at all to please the temperance reformers—but simply because Government is instituted to protect person and property.

The friends of temperance are contemplating the organization of a political temperance party. They will fail to gather a considerable party. But they will not need an independent political party, if they shall consent to confine their political war to the dramshop. A call upon the existing political parties, not in the alarming name of temperance, but in the quiet and accepted name of protection—of that protection, which is due from Government to every man, woman and child—to shut up the satanic dramshop, would not be in vain, if backed up by the undivided temperance host. The Republican Party and the Democratic Party would rival each other in their quickness to respond to this call. Then down would go the dramshop, that Gibraltar of intemperance; and the way be thus prepared for completing by moral agencies

the work of temperance. Effectually, though but incidentally to its working for protection of person and property, will Government then open the way in which the friends of temperance can march on to victory. [☞ If the existing parties should refuse to adopt this principle of protection, then, by all that is just and necessary, let there be no delay in organizing an independent party—for the Government that is unfaithful to this principle is no Government.]

But you are impatient to ask me: "How about beer?" When I say that Government must stop dramselling, however severe the penalties upon both seller and buyer necessary to effect it, I include in dramselling such and only such liquors, without naming them, as intoxicate or craze, and thereby fearfully peril person and property. If, as some juries have found, beer but dulls or stupefies instead of crazing, then Government is not to include it in its condemnation of dramselling—for, in such case, the drinker of it would but damage himself, and not be an occasion of danger to others. In every prosecution let a jury decide whether the liquor in question is or is not intoxicating or crazing.

I wish I could live to see the friends of temperance cease from their long and vain practice of asking Government for so much, as to get nothing. All that Government has the right to do for their cause, or that they need to have done for it by Government, is to shut up the dramshops; and even this much it can legitimately do, not as aiming to help temperance, but only as the official protector of person and property. I am happy to believe that the vast majority of the temperance men have become sick of "license laws." What can be innocently sold Government should suffer to be freely sold; and what cannot be innocently sold Government should not suffer to be sold at all. A large share of the temperance men still cling to the fancy of "local option laws." It is, however, a wild fancy. Giving a town permission to decide for itself whether a road or bridge shall be built here or there may be very well. But to leave it to decide whether perjury, forgery, theft, or that great fountain-head of crimes the dramshop, shall or shall not be allowed within its limits, is both wild and wicked. The "civil damages law," which the mass of temperance men make themselves hoarse with praising, reaches the very climax of absurdity. Nothing can be more absurd than licensing a man to sell intoxicating liquors, and then punishing him for the perfectly natural results of the licensed business. The cry for "absolute prohibition" is swelling just now. But "absolute prohibition" is absolute folly, as is every other vain and utterly impracticable thing.

I said that I wished to live to see the friends of temperance give up their unwise political action. I add that I should not need to live more than two or three years to see temperance on a sure road to triumph were its friends to give up such action and to betake themselves unitedly to the one essential work of urging Government to fulfil its highest duty in shutting up the dramshop.

A great blessing, aside from its decisive advantage to the cause of temperance, would the friends of temperance confer upon their country and upon mankind by uniting at this time to insist with all the power of their votes on the duty of Government to protect person and property. But a far greater blessing than this would come of it. It would be a wide step toward the ground that this is the only duty of Government—that its only duty is to hold a shield over the heads of the people beneath which they may be left free to work out their own salvation or their own destruction. A wise people can save themselves. A foolish people Government cannot save.

When Government shall be brought back from all its usurpations and kept within its limits, the people will be as much bl[illegible] cursed by the [illegible] be no more approaches to a union of church [illegible] Then Government will have nothing more to do with the sabbath question. It will be held to afford no more protection to sabbath-keepers than to non-sabbath keepers. Then Government will be shut out of the school, where it makes so much disturbance now, and will make still more ere it is shut out. Then will be seen the falseness of the plea that the people will not voluntarily support the cause of education. The present voluntary contributions to that cause very far exceed the compulsory: and the void there would be from the withdrawal of Government would be quickly filled by private benevolence. Then Government will no longer be the self-constituted almoner of the people's bounty—but the people will deal out their charities for themselves. They will themselves give away of their own; and not suffer Government to give it away for them. Then, too, Government will leave the people to build their own canals and railroads, and will itself undertake no work, but what is strictly for the protection of the country. Then, in a word, would Government be confined to its one duty of protecting person and property—and, this too, simply by brute force—leaving moral force to be exerted by the people. But does this duty include all its duties? It does. You cannot conceive of one, which it does not include.

1st. Will it not leave an honest man's reputation at the mercy of the slanderer and libeller? It will not. Reputation is property, and property of the most sacred kind: and Government is, therefore, emphatically in the line of its duty when it provides redress for a wronged reputation.

2d. Would not this narrow definition of Government allow the grossest indecencies to be enacted in our streets with impunity? Certainly not! For, if permitted, they would render the property, which they face, untenantable and valueless. From this and all other nuisances Government must protect our persons and our property. It must, especially, forbid obscene publications and pictures, which, by their sudden inflaming of the passions, endanger personal security.

3d. And must not Government provide lunatic asylums? Certainly! For the insane left at large, are a source of danger to person and property. Government must secure society from them as well as from the criminal classes. I admit that asylums for the blind and for deaf mutes and some other institutions and objects, which Government is wont to aid, would, under my definition of its province, have to depend upon private benevolence. The dependence would not, however, be vain.

The gain from confining Government to its one legitimate work is not only to hold it back from usurping the work of the people, but it is also to secure a doing of its own work far more thoroughly than when it is distracted and seduced by numberless claims to its attention.

I confess that I am jealous of Government and dread its tendency to invade individual and family rights. I will, also, confess that I have great confidence in the people, and believe it to be derogatory to their dignity to be held in the leading strings of Government, and destructive to their manhood to hamper them with sumptuary laws, or follow them with any dog-at-the-heels laws. The people can do their own work. All that they require at the hand of Government is to be protected whilst they are doing it.

I close with referring to a great lack. The statesman lacks the ardor of the reformer; and the reformer lacks the wisdom of the statesman. Happy for the world when both shall be blended in the same person.

Respectfully yours,

GERRIT SMITH.

SPAIN.—CUBA.

(BY GERRIT SMITH.)

34

In a Speech, made in February 1861 in the Capitol at Albany and printed in the New York Tribune, the position was taken that France and England and the other nations were bound to intervene and put an end to American slavery. The argument, which leaned in this position, was that mankind being a unit, and the whole world being charged with the care of the whole world, every part of the human family is responsible for the huge and persistent wrongs suffered in any part of it. The conventional arrangement which divides the people of the earth into nations, and leaves to each of them the ordinary government of itself, was admitted to be necessary. Nevertheless it was held that this arrangement does not authorize a moment's abdication of the world's government of the world, nor a moment's neglect on the part of that wide and universal government to supervise the workings of the subordinate or national governments. The great sacred principle, which lies at the base of this all-comprehensive government, and out of which such government grows, is that by Divine appointment every man is the brother and keeper of every other man. The argument admitted that it is not for this universal government to take cognizance of all wrongs—of such as are temporary and of such as are comparatively small. It must look to the national governments to correct these; and it must always be patient, even generously patient, with those governments. But in the presence of such gigantic crimes as slavery, the legislation, the thuggee and other monstrous outbreaks against human rights, this world government must act promptly and effectually, or justly be held responsible for them.

This position taken in the Speech referred to was, of course, disapproved by many as unpatriotic and even traitorous. It was, however, true and called for. Better was it thus to testify against a wicked nation, even though it be our own, that had imbrued and worse than murdered many millions and that was determined to imbrute and worse than murder many more millions, than to be disloyal to humanity and heaven. But if intervention was right in the case of these high crimes in our own country, with all possible emphasis is it allowable, yea demanded, in the case of the higher, more heinous and more persistent crimes in Cuba. For Cuba is of all the earth the land of slavery and slaughter. One of our eloquent men has well said that the record of Spain in that unhappy island is a river of blood with a border of gold. She has, indeed, sought gold there at the cost of a never-ceasing flow of blood.

When I ascribe to Cuba the pre-eminence in crimes and horrors, I make no account of such comparatively little things as the summary and murderous disposition of scores of the crew and passengers of the Virginius, the murder of the school boys for playing in the cemetery of Havana or the murder of Speakman and Wyoth. These were but some of Spain's mere sips of blood. This pre-eminence consists in that broad and deep current of her cruelties, which, in its sweep through nearly four centuries, has left of the vast number of natives she found upon the island and of all their descendants not so much as one individual. Las Casas' history of these unparalleled cruelties gives but a few specimens or small sections of them. This pre-eminence consists, too, in her enslaving of Africans, many millions of whom have gone up from that blood-soaked island to testify at the bar of God against the cruellest type of slavery the world ever saw. What further justifies the ascription of this pre-eminence is the fact that Spain still holds in Cuba several hundred thousand slaves, and holds them, too, not only in defiance of the well-nigh universal sentiment of Christendom but of that decree of the Revolutionary government of the island, which, five years ago, abolished all the slavery existing upon it. By the way, how cruel and causeless the suspicion still entertained by some honorable men of the honesty of this decree! There is not one fact to impeach, but there are innumerable facts to attest, the perfect sincerity of its authors. Right here let me say that nothing can be more absurd than to look to Spain for good faith in the matter of slavery. She is the nation, that was so base as to give her promise to Great Britain to abandon the slave-trade and that, after being paid much money for the lying promise, did nothing whatever toward fulfilling it. And what still further entitles Spain to this pre-eminence in wickedness is her destroying, within the last five years, the lives of nearly a hundred thousand native Cubans, who had to resist her because they could no longer bear her heavy iron yoke. This destruction of life is so great, because Spain, whatever she may do elsewhere, spares the life of no prisoner in Cuba.

Surely, surely, if there were ever a case where the nations are bound to intervene for the rescue of a most cruelly crushed people, the poor peeled and persecuted Cubans present such a case. Amongst the many reasons for it are the following:

First. At the rate the population and wealth of this exceedingly fertile and beautiful island are wasting away, she would, ere long, become a thinly-peopled desert.

Second. Scarcely more does Cuba need to get rid of Spain than Spain to get rid of Cuba. Spain is fast wasting her men and money in her attempt to re-subjugate the native Cubans; and the attempt is not more expensive than vain! She can never overcome the revolutionists. For five years she has put forth her frantic and infernal efforts to this end, and has yet been continually getting further and further from it. The revolutionists possess, or at least control, more than half the territory of the island: and of the hundred thousand soldiers she has sent to subdue them, very few (thanks to the Cuban climate as well as to Cuban valor!) have lived to return. The revolutionists can never be at peace with Spain. They can never forgive nor forget the matchless wrongs, that goaded them into revolution. It is, in a word, for the life of Spain as well as for the life of Cuba, that the nations insist on her abdicating the government of Cuba. Her merciless and greedy rule of Cuba has for ages been the great clog to the prosperity of Spain—especially to her advancement in all that invests a nation with dignity and moral grandeur.

Third. This intervention and rescue would be such an upward step in the history of mankind as would effectually warn the wicked in every part of the world not to trample upon any portion of mankind. It would serve mightily to make human nature sacred and glorious in the eyes of all. Heaven forbid that the most favorable opportunity there has ever been for this universal or world-government to make a signal and impressive manifestation of its care for all the children of men, and to assert its supremacy over nations, may not be allowed to pass away unimproved! Now is the time to bless the whole earth by an example which will tell upon the whole earth. Rescue Cuba now, and therein will a warning to the wicked go down through all the ages. Rescue Cuba now, and there will probably never be such another land of sufferings and sorrows to rescue. On the other hand there will but too probably be many another such land, if the appeal which wronged and wretched Cuba makes to the nations shall be ignored by them.

Fourth. This proposed action would be pleasing to the Great Father of us all because it would be an emphatic and sublime recognition of the human brotherhood, and of the equal rights *of all His children.*

Fifth. Cavillers may stigmatize this Intervention and rescue as war. But it would be a war of fraternity and love, in which a selfish war, instead of finding countenance, would find but rebuke and shame. The spirit of hell has much to do with ordinary wars. In this war would be the spirit of heaven. It may be added in this connexion that but little blood would be shed in this truly "holy war." If only Spain were held back, Cuba with her fifteen hundred thousand well united people, including of course all her slaves, would quickly free herself from the thirty or forty thousand Spanish butchers in her island.

Let then Great Britain or America or both, or some other nation or nations to whom it might be as convenient, go forth in the name of the nations and the God of the nations to deliver poor bleeding Cuba from her cruel thraldom: and let there be no delay in this work of wisdom and love—a work whose blessed effect will be to bring man nearer to man and earth nearer to heaven. I would here say that it is all important for each effect that this work be and be seen of all men to be entirely and sublimely disinterested. To this end, whatever nation shall have a part in delivering Cuba should pledge itself in advance not to annex her to itself nor to suffer such annexation, unless Cuba shall, after a period of say some five or ten years, insist upon such annexation. No ulterior object should accompany the undertaking to make Cuba absolutely free and independent.

Idle and worse than idle—even very wicked—is all this talk about settling the Virginius matter with Spain and then letting Cuba remain in the hands of her torturer and murderer. What she would hereafter do with Cuba is but too plain in the light of what she has heretofore done with her.

Nor is there any wisdom in the advice to delay decisive action regarding Cuba until the Spanish Republic is consolidated. The probability of such consolidation is exceedingly slight. No nation has poorer materials for a Republic than has Spain. I see that some of our prominent old abolitionists look to the Spanish Republic and especially to the influence of that admirable and eloquent republican, Castelar, for the abolition of Cuban slavery. But what if Spain should become an established Republic, would the abolition of Cuban slavery necessarily follow? By no means. Republicanism no less than monarchy accommodates itself to slave-holding. We were a Republic when we held so tenaciously to the enslavement of many millions. The Garrisons and the Phillipses of America, no less wise and eloquent than the Castelars of Spain, long plied the public conscience with the sins and miseries of slavery—all in vain however to effect its abolition. But for the timely advent of John Brown—of that grand old hero, whose "soul goes marching on"—slavery would have been as vigorous upon our soil to-day as it ever was. God grant that this dear old soul may keep marching on until, not only in Cuba but in all the broad earth, the Sun shall not rise upon a slaveholder nor set upon a slave!

PETERBORO Dec. 1st 1873.

GERRIT SMITH TO GEORGE T. DOWNING.

35

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR BLACKS AND WHITES.

PETERBORO March 6th 1874.

GEORGE T. DOWNING, Esq.,

MY DEAR SIR,

Your article in the N. Y. Independent on the Civil Rights Bill I have read with pleasure. On account of an obstinate attack of vertigo, I have, for months, forborne to write on the subject of the Bill. And I now write you this letter, not because I feel able to write it—but because, under my apprehension that the black man is threatened with further oppression, my spirit cannot rest unless it be testifying, though ever so feebly, against the meanness, cruelty and great wickedness of such oppression.

I confess that I am somewhat afraid that the Civil Rights Bill, or any other which may be substantially like it, will fail to become a law. One effect of this failure will be the death of the Republican party. For having come into power as a reform party, and having continued in power as such, it will, of necessity, cease to live when it shall cease to be a reform party. I do not apprehend that its death will be followed by the resturation of the Democratic party to power. That party, in its earlier days a progressive and good one, became a miserably conservative and bad one. Notwithstanding there was a countless number of patriotic and noble men in it, the party allowed itself, by force of its pro-slavery training, to sympathize with the enemy in our late War. This sympathy was fatal to it. It was a sin not to be forgiven. The party, though it may struggle, years longer, against its constantly approaching destiny, must at last break up, and its members become free to attach themselves to some party of less odious name and of less fatal traditions. The old Federal party abounded in great and good men. Nevertheless as it saw that it could never recover from its mistake of sympathizing with our enemy in the War of 1812-15, it deliberately disbanded very soon after that War.

For the Republican party to claim to be any longer a reform party after it shall have refused equality of civil rights to the millions of our colored countrymen would be absurd. Its excuse for this high crime against God and man, that these millions are ignorant, would be base and impudent to the last degree. For not only is the ignorance of a race no excuse for robbing it of the rights of our common humanity, but the last people for whose advantage this excuse should be offered are they, who enslaved and therefore darkened and debased this ignorant race. Alas, is there to be no end to the wrongs of this unoffending and gentle people, who, instead of wreaking revenge upon us for their ages of oppression, forgave us and shed their blood to save us!

The Decision of the U. S. Supreme Court in the New Orleans Slaughter Case is much relied on by the opponents of the Civil Rights Bill. But this Decision should be quoted modestly rather than confidently, seeing that four of the Judges, and the Chief Justice one of the four, dissented from it. The Court, to render clearer its distinction of two classes of citizens—one of the State, and the other of the United States—enumerates some of the privileges and immunities of the latter. Amongst these privileges and immunities is his (the U. S. citizen's) right "to come to the seat of Government to assert any claim he may have upon that Government, or transact any business he may have with it, to seek its protection, to share its offices, to engage in administering its functions. He has the right to free access to its seaports through which all operations of foreign commerce are conducted, to the sub-treasuries, land offices, and courts of justice in the several States: also the right to peaceably assemble and petition redress of grievances."

But how can a black man enjoy these immunities and privileges if he be denied, save on the most degrading terms, the public vehicles and hotels? and denied them he will be, unless he shall be able to prove, at every stage of his journey, that he is travelling in the capacity of a United States citizen. Or is it meant that the black man, be he a Federal or a State citizen, is to walk and not ride, to carry bread and cheese in his pocket instead of sitting at the well-furnished table, and instead of a comfortable bed in doors, to steal away like a fugitive slave into the woods? And how can he hold a Federal office in a negro-hating State without his right to the decent accommodations, refined pleasures and respectful treatment enjoyed by white office holders being frequently called in question? Hence, notwithstanding this enumeration of rights in the Decision, there are not two classes of black citizens—for such citizens cannot freely exercise these rights when they are in States, which deny equal rights to black men. But if a State has the power to disable a black man and deprive him of citizenship, it must have no less power over a white man also. So it turns out that this class of United States citizens is but a conditional class—conditioned on the will and action of the States. A constitutional class of citizens must however have an *absolute* existence: and this great nation is not under the humiliating necessity of getting the consent of little Rhode Island or little Delaware, ere it can invest the people of the United States with absolute citizenship. The constitution knows one and only one class of citizens—viz. "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof."

Better would it be to break up our nation and pronounce it an utter failure than not to admit that it is bound to protect all classes of its citizens, Federal or State, from insults and outrages at the hands of their State governments. This it is bound to do by the spirit if not by the literal requirement of its constitutional obligation to guarantee to every State a republican form of government. And, just here, let me say that, after the rivers of blood shed in our land in the cause of freedom, equality and fraternity, republican government means much more than it formerly meant. It is no longer regarded as a *republican* government under which a man has the less rights for being a black man. The War has changed all that. It has brought back the nation out of the slough of the pro-slavery interpretations of the constitution to the high ground of the Declaration of Independence on which it set out. The nation has entered upon another stage of its journey. It must now uphold, and practically too, the equal rights of all men. The black man and the white man are now equals before the law. Their social rights the law has nothing to do with, and neither party invokes its help in that matter. But their equal legal rights are to be strictly maintained—and, if need be, enforced at whatever cost. If a State tramples down any portion of its people, then constitution or no constitution, the nation must by the paramount laws of humanity and heaven lift them up again.

But it is said that this bringing of white and black children into the same school will not soon be found practicable, especially at the South. Yes, it will. Before bravely asserted reason prejudice melts away rapidly. What, however, if, in this case, prejudice shall turn out to be unexpectedly obstinate? which party must yield—must it be God, who "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," or shall it not rather be the Devil, who delights in this caste spirit—for it is his own spirit? In other words, which shall yield, the innocent and humble black man or the haughty and guilty white one? Ten years ago, it was not thought possible at the South that white members of Congress could ever consent to sit by the side of black members of Congress: and, ten years hence, the mingling of white school children with black school children will be as fully acquiesced in as is the present mingling of white men and black men in the halls of Congress. *Tempora mutantur*, &c. The times change, and happily we change with them.

Constitutional questions are freely raised against the Civil Rights Bill. May the day draw near when such questions shall no longer be raised against fundamental human rights! A constitution, which is not built upon the recognition of our common humanity, is entitled to no respect. A constitution, founded on favor to one sex or to one complexion, and guilty of ignoring the equal rights of the other sex or other complexion, is to be spurned. No constitution, no statute, no human paper, however good it may be, is to be an acknowledged authority in determining essential human rights. The right to our manhood and to the conditions of maintaining our manhood (such conditions, for instance, as are contained in the Civil Rights Bill) is not derived from the constitution. It comes from a source infinitely more sacred and authoritative—from a law infinitely older than the oldest works of men—from the law of human nature and of God. No judge is to pause to inquire whether by the constitution a man's a man. The man is himself the sufficient and sole proof of the fact. To go back of that proof is to insult him and insult his Maker, who made man in his own image. In all matters pertaining to its proper sphere we can hardly show too much respect to the constitution. But in matters beyond that sphere, the constitution is no law.

Of all American judges I recall but one who, when the question of essential and inalienable human rights came before him, at once "struck hard pan," and based his decision simply and solely upon the immutable and everlasting law of God. Judge Harrington of Vermont may not have been a judge of high rank. Nevertheless, the highest niche in our American temple of justice is his appropriate place and deserved honor. For when the claimant of the fugitive slave impatiently asked what more could be required to substantiate his claim than the Bill of Sale lying before the court, the sturdy old Vermonter replied in thunder tones: "a Bill of Sale from God Almighty!" Worshippers of constitutions and human laws told the judge that the trembling one before him was a slave. But God told him—not a slave, but a man: and the judge agreed with the Apostles that it is better "to hearken unto God" than unto men. Would that the brave and sublime spirit, which made a grand man of Judge Harrington, might enter into the breasts of all our members of Congress and so make grand men of them also! Then would the Civil Rights Bill be safe.

Respectfully your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

[illegible] UPON THE DRAMSHOP.

[BY GERRIT SMITH.]

Most miserable of all men is the drunkard. More miserable, however, than he is the *wife* of the drunkard. Not less true is it that the children of the drunkard have a harder lot than any other children. Is it then to be wondered at that the women are, at last, rising up against the dramshops? Nay, is it not rather a matter of wonder that their characteristic patience and gentleness have borne so long with these the great manufactories of drunkards?—with these the sweeping destroyers of the peace and bloody invaders of the safety of their families? How could they be still any longer? The men would not vote to shut up these "breathing holes of hell"; and the men would not suffer the women to vote it. Hence the despair—the *wild* despair, if you please to call it such—in which they are now acting. John Brown saw slavery to be stronger than ever, and, in very desperation he dashed himself against it. Dear woman sees the murderous dramshop to be stronger than ever—to have a stronger hold than ever upon the habits of the people—and, conscious of her weakness, she nevertheless encounters it. But as God's presence in the John Brown movement verified the old saying that: "man's extremity is God's opportunity," so will it be verified—nay is already verified—in this woman's movement. Slavery is dead; and, at no distant day, the dramshop will be dead. God glorified not the abolitionists but Himself in the fall of slavery; and He will glorify not the Temperance Societies but Himself in the fall of the dramshop. It will be just like Himself, if He shall let all the mighty machinery employed in the cause of Temperance for the last fifty years come to naught, and crown with success the pleadings of woman with God and man. With the help of God, the "stripling" David killed great Goliath; and with that help feeble woman can kill the dramshop—is already killing it.

The press and myriads of tongues abound in criticisms on these distressed women, and charge them with violating the proprieties of their sex and the legal rights of the dramseller. But with these criticisms I can have no sympathy. If in their agony of soul, they should, now and then, be seen rushing to besiege a dramshop, with hair dishevelled and clothing hurriedly and imperfectly put on, I, for one, could have no heart to remonstrate—no, nor if they should leave insufficient room on the sidewalk for the dram drinkers. To find fault with these weary and heart-broken women is to begin at the wrong end. The first duty is to relieve them of their intolerable oppression, and to stop making drunkards of their husbands, sons and brothers. After that will be time enough to urge upon them the claims of decorum and the scrupulous observance of the doubtful rights of drunkard-makers.

I rejoice that the women see just where to strike in order to cripple the enemy and leave him no power to prolong the fight. Would that the temperance men were as discerning, and were concentrating their force in the same direction, instead of striking all around the compass and hitting nothing effectually. Women see that it is dramselling—the selling of alcoholic beverages to be drank upon the premises, as in hotels and saloons—which makes the vast majority of drunkards—and that once an end is put to this branch of drunkard-making—to this, which is rather the very tap-root and trunk of the satanic business—the remaining victories in the cause of temperance will be easily achieved. Let the men follow in this wake of the women, and insist at the ballot-box that Government shall make an end of this dramselling, and very few years would pass away ere our country would be rejoicing not merely in the dawn but in the noonday brightness of temperance. And to do this they need not call upon Government to espouse the cause of temperance—for it is admitted that Government has no right to espouse any moral reform. They need but call on it to be true to its single office of protecting person and property—and surely it cannot be true to it so long as it suffers the dramshop to peril them so frightfully. Moreover, whilst the dramshop far surpasses all things else in perilling them, no plea can be offered for its usefulness in any respect or in any degree. The temperance men have but to insist on this duty at the hands of Government, and all political parties will straightway stand with them—for none of them could afford to deny that the suppression of the dramshop is vital to the protection of person and property.

The friends of temperance are right in using their moral influence against all intoxicating drinks in all places—but they are wrong in requiring the action of Government to be commensurate with this wide range of moral influence. Government is less than Government when it permits the existence of the dramshop. It is more than Government when it makes war upon all intoxicating drinks in all places. Government must leave large freedom to the people. It must, for instance, leave them free to tell lies, but not to commit perjury. It must leave them free to practise many arts and much deceit in making gain—but it must not leave them to steal. It must not deny them all traffic in inotxicating liquors, but it must not suffer society to be demoralized and destroyed by dramselling. "Total abstinence," so far as it is voluntary, is excellent—but "absolute prohibition" should not be and cannot be enforced. In enforcing it, Government would be guilty of encroaching on the domain of individual freedom, and thus of defeating the great end of Civil Government, which is the protection of that freedom. Would that the temperance men might give themselves to a little study of the limitations of Government! There would then be far less danger of their being swept past these limitations on the tide of their benevolence.

Our prevailing and appalling drunkenness would soon be a thing of the past were,

First, the absurd and abominable license system abolished, and "local option" kicked out of sight.

Second, the dramseller forbidden to carry on his work of death and damnation—and forbidden it under effectual penalties—penalties reaching, if found necessary, even as far as confinement in the State Prison.

Third, and the drunkard punished as he should be, for perilling by his responsible insanity the rights of others.

Go on, dear women, in your heaven-blest work! and stop not so long as there remains one dramshop to make idiots and madmen of its frequenters. Let not men succeed in making you ashamed of your undertaking as an *unwomanly* one. The shame is all on them, who have set up and kept up the dramshop. To you, who overthrow it, will be honor and thanks forever and ever. We recognize in you the instruments that God is employing in the most powerful and precious revival of religion that ever brought salvation to the wretched and ruined; and we rejoice that "the weapons of your warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds." We recognize God Himself in this revival—for He and He alone could so sustain you and so multiply your glorious victories. We recognize His own Son in it—for He died to redeem the world from this body and soul-destroying sin of the dramshop. We believe His Holy Spirit to be its enlightening and guiding influence and its vital breath. In the sublime presence of such a blessed revival, we stand filled with wonder, gratitude and praise.

PETERBORO *March* 24 1874.

"THE BIBLE NOT A MORAL ABOLITIONIST."

[BY GERRIT SMITH.]

37.

The Bible, after criticism upon it has exhausted itself, remains the best and grandest and most authoritative of all books. Hence, when it is arrayed against a reform it presents an obstacle not easily surmounted nor evaded. Of all the barriers in the way of the antislavery reform the most formidable and disheartening was the bible, or rather the misinterpretations of the bible. Such, too, has it been at every step in the way of the cause of temperance:—and, just now, when this cause (thanks to dear woman!) is advancing more rapidly than ever, the appeals to the bible against it are becoming more frequent than ever. As usual, learned divines are foremost in this evil work. I am happy, however, to be able to say that the great majority of both learned and unlearned divines are steadfast in their opposition to it.

Total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks is the great central doctrine of the temperance reform, and the pre-eminent duty which it inculcates. Nevertheless, it is denied that this is amongst the doctrines and duties set forth in the bible. We are not, however, to look into the bible to learn what is suitable to drink or eat or wear. These and ten thousand other things we are to learn from observation, experience and science. In passing, we may say that, although there are passages in the bible, which seem to favor intoxicating drinks, there are also warnings in it against these body and soul-destroyers—warnings as emphatic and fearful as they are numerous. But it is argued that Jesus partook of inebriating beverages, and that the bible is, therefore, to be taken to be for them. It is not certain that He partook of them—but He probably did. Whether, however, He be viewed as God or man, his partaking of them affords us no warrant to indulge in them, and does not make the bible responsible for them. For to have broadly distinguished his general modes of life and labor from those of the good men around him would have had the effect to turn men's minds away from his lessons on their supreme interests. Doubtless He planed his board as other carpenters planed theirs. He did not summon the building from its foundation into miraculous and instantaneous completion—but carried it forward by gradations as did other builders. He did not, as by the supposition of his omniscience He could have done, select only perfectly healthful dishes and perfectly healthful drinks. But He "came eating and drinking," and, in common with other men, ate and drank what was set before him. Had He made dietetics or dress a part of his direct teaching, He would have defeated the great end of his mission—for He would have thereby diverted the public attention from his soul-saving messages. He would also have defeated it, had He, by the introduction of rail-roads or steam-vessels, so filled the world with wonder, as to leave no room and no relish for his sublime morality and regenerating religion. Jesus did not anticipate providence: and He requires us but to keep pace with its unfoldings. He bears with a people, who do so well as to live up to the light of their generation. "The times of this ignorance God winked at." He excused the sins of ignorance, especially of irresponsible ignorance. In the days of Christ, men had not yet learned that intoxicating liquors are unfit—to the last degree dangerously unfit—for a beverage. Least of all had they, as yet, learned that total abstinence from them is the only sure preventive, as well as the only sure cure, of drunkenness. Jesus did not teach his hearers these things directly and literally—but He left men to learn thereafter what, as yet, men were not able to learn. He supplied them with principles and precepts in the growing light of which they could learn these things for themselves—in the boundless scope of which every candid mind could so enlighten itself as to learn all it needs to learn. The question which most concerns us, is not what Jesus taught and required in the dimness of nearly two thousand years ago—but what does He teach and require in the present illumination of the world. The highest temperance doctrine which Lyman Beecher taught fifty years ago in his mighty and memorable "Six Sermons" was total abstinence from *ardent* spirit. Moderate, however, as was that teaching, it was, nevertheless, greatly in advance of the light of that day. But were this grand old pioneer now on the earth, he would, doubtless, in the increased light of the present day, teach total abstinence not only from *ardent* spirit but from all intoxicating spirit. Indeed, I greatly err if I did not learn that in the National Temperance Convention held at Saratoga many years before his death, he acquiesced in this unlimited application of the doctrine of total abstinence. If when Lyman Beecher came to see that all alcoholic beverages go to make drunkards, no wonder that his pity for this most miserable class of men and for their even more miserable families should set him immovably against all such beverages! From the doctrines the blessed Savior has left us we easily deduce the duty of total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages, and, by faithful study, can also deduce every other duty. Specific directions could, at the most, have taught but a fragmentary morality—but these doctrines cover the whole extent of human obligation with a rounded and perfect morality. I might add that the few specific directions there are in the bible are chiefly valuable as serving to illustrate its all comprehensive principles.

Not only is it claimed that Jesus drank alcoholic wine, but also that He made it. From the probabilities of the case it is easy to believe that He drank it—but I can hardly believe that He made it. He would not consent to render himself peculiar, offensively peculiar, and to divert attention from his work of salvation by refusing, on the ground of their imperfect healthfulness, the dishes and drinks that were universally enjoyed by the respectable portion of his countrymen. But, if called on to create either a dish or a drink, would not his omnipotence, under the promptings of his omniscience and benevolence, have made it entirely healthful and harmless? Jesus was not responsible for any of the imperfections in the dishes and drinks made by those around him;—but how could He have escaped responsibility for imperfections in the dishes and drinks made by himself? Did He make injurious food for the thousands He miraculously fed? Certainly not. No more did He make injurious wine for the wedding guests. But it was injurious—ay, of fearfully dangerous tendency both to the body and the soul—if He put into it the intoxicating element. If on his confessed policy of conforming, in the main, to prevalent habits and customs, an argument can be built in favor of his partaking of food and drinks not strictly healthy, it by no means follows that this policy furnishes an argument for his *making* such food or such drinks.

What we have said is sufficient to justify the conclusion that the bible is not against "total abstinence"—is not against this only sure preventive and only sure remedy of the most destructive of all vices. The insulting interpretations put upon this heavenly book by its official and accepted interpreters have done infinite harm. The abolitionists believed with dear John Wesley that "slavery is the sum of all villainies." Hence not a few of them gave up the bible after the Doctors of Divinity had persuaded them that it is for slavery. So, too, have not a few temperance men found their faith in the bible wrested from them by the seductive arguments to prove that it is not a temperance book.

Away with all these evil teachers, and let common sense and common honesty teach in their stead! The bible is not against temperance—is not against total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages—is not against the undeniable truth that drunkenness has its origin in moderate drinking. On the contrary, the bible is emphatically for total abstinence. So, too, is the increasing light of all the steps of providence for it. The loving heart of Christ is for it. All heaven is for it. All the precious interests of earth are for it. There is nothing left against it but ignorance and wickedness.

Let not, then, the friends of temperance hesitate, through fear of being called fanatics, to wield all possible moral influence against the drinking of every kind of intoxicating liquor. Reason forbids such drinking, and there is no fanaticism in following reason. And let not the friends of temperance doubt that such influence is ample to accomplish the triumph of temperance. Above all, let them not call on Government to contribute to this triumph. No less important is it to temperance than to every other great interest to keep Government within its own limits. It transcends them, however, when it embarks in any moral or religious enterprise, or when, in short, it does aught else than protect by simple brute force person and property from the destruction and grave danger, which Government alone can protect them from. Preeminently such a destruction and danger is the dramshop, that den of death where liquor is sold to be drunk on the premises. From that den of death—death both to the body and the soul—proceeds, day and night, a huge and endless stream of incendiaries, madmen and murderers. No family within its reach is safe; and any state or nation, that upholds it, upholds within itself an enemy more to be dreaded than all foreign enemies. The Government, therefore, which permits dramselling, is guilty of throwing away that shield of protection, which it is its one office to hold over the persons and property of its citizens. Indeed, it is not too much to say that it fails to be Government, since it fails at the very point where Government is most vitally needed. This plain truth

no political party could resist and yet prosper. Let them the temperance men press it upon all political parties, and, very soon, the land will be free from the dramshop. This will not be making temperance parties of these parties. It will be simply bringing them to recognize the protection of person and property to be the one great duty of Government.

Although Government cannot legitimately afford any direct aid to the cause of temperance, nevertheless, in suppressing the dramshop, it would bring to it an incidental aid so great, as would leave comparatively little more for the friends of temperance to do. To shut up the dramshop would be well-nigh to decapitate the monster Intemperance; and to accomplish this, no punishment of the drunkard and drunkard-maker should be considered too severe.—Drinking in families is a small evil compared with drinking in hotels and saloons; and it would be much smaller, were it not promoted by this public drinking. Would, then, that these exorbitant demands on Government, which have been pressed more or less constantly for half a century, might, at last, cease. Government will rarely to any considerable extent yield to them; and scarcely ever will the yielding fail to be followed by a reaction, that will leave temperance all the worse off for the unwise attempt to serve it.

Government must not and will not be guilty of such an invasion of individual and family rights, as would be the forbidding of all traffic in intoxicating drinks; as would be forbidding the housewife to make her annual keg of currant or pleplant wine; and the farmer to convert his spare apples into cider; or as would be the forbidding of the importation of all foreign wines and brandies, however strong might be the plea for the superiority of their medicinal properties. No, Government must not and will not allow itself to be driven into such fanaticism. Are we told that the temperance men in England go about as far in their demands on Government, as do the temperance men in America? Our answer is that Government in a monarchy is a different thing from Government in a republic. In the one it means the absorption of individual and private rights. In the other it means their protection.

Honest and worthy are the temperance men: and, had they kept united and in the right path, they would, ere this, have succeeded in their great work of love and mercy. But, unhappily, whilst a part of them have asked nothing more of Government than to do its own work of protecting person and property, the far greater part of them have insisted that Government should turn moral reformer and do the work of temperance also. So, too, whilst all temperance men desire to impress the public mind with the criminality of dramselling, a large part of them, carried away by the great folly and unprincipled inconsistency of "Local Option," would have Government leave it to each town, village and city to choose for itself whether to indulge in dramshops. But if dramselling be a crime (and who should deny that it approaches pre-eminence amongst all crimes?) then, very clearly, Government has no more right to let a community set up dramshops than it has to let it welcome perjury, forgery or theft. Another blunder into which not a few temperance men have fallen is their advocacy of the "Civil Damage Law." This Law reaches the height of absurdity, inasmuch as it provides that Government shall punish the man whose business it has licensed—ay, punish him for the natural and necessary results of that business.

I conclude by saying that, if by force of their sincerity and earnestness the friends of temperance have been able to do so much for their dear cause, what but for these unhappy differences to which I have adverted might they not have done for it? Ere this, they might, not improbably, have put upon their labors the crown of triumph;—for between their shutting up the dramshop and that crown there would have been but a few short steps. If action! action!! action!!! were the proper direction to orators, no less proper is it to comprise in one thing the work of temperance men, and bid them: "shut up the dramshop! shut up the dramshop!! shut up the dramshop!!!"

PETERBORO, May 14, 1874.

Letter from Gerrit Smith to Frederick Douglass.

PETERBORO, June 27th 1874.

HON. FREDERICK DOUGLASS, *Washington, D. C.*

MY OLD AND MUCH ESTEEMED FRIEND,

So Congress has again adjourned without passing the Bill on which our hearts had so long been set!

Much prejudice was wrought up against the Bill by persistently declaring it to be a Bill for *social* rights. None of its friends regarded it in this light. All they sought in it was the equality of civil rights. Social rights they left to take care of themselves—wisely judging that these do not fall within the scope of legislation.

This prejudice, however, was not the only nor the worst form of opposition to the Bill. As is usual in cases where the protection of fundamental human rights is the object, this Bill had to encounter the constitution-scare-crow. On the surface of the constitution simple birth in this nation makes a citizen of the nation. But, in the New Orleans Slaughter case, the Supreme Court dug down below the surface and taxed its ingenuity to discover two kinds of citizens—a State kind as well as a national kind. This mischievous discovery, though made by but five of the nine judges, has, in the present instance, furnished the enemies of equal rights with their most effective weapon. But this dual citizenship is fanciful—fanciful, if only because impracticable. I would argue its impracticableness somewhat as I argued it in my Letter to Mr. Downing.

Of all the instances in which the Court asserts the paramount right of national citizenship there is not one where this right could not be defeated in a State which is guilty of discriminating between its people. One of these instances is the coming to the seat of Government to transact business with it. But how could cultured and self-respecting colored gentlemen and refined colored ladies cross such a State as Georgia on their way to transact business in Washington? Denied its vehicles, save on terms too degrading for them to submit to, instead of riding they must walk: and denied its hotels, save on similarly degrading terms, they must depend upon the bread and cheese in their pockets, and find what sleep they can by the roadside. Is it said that they must be supplied with proofs that they are, at such times, in the capacity of *national* citizens? But the expense of giving effect to such proofs they might not be able to bear. Moreover, however conclusive the proofs and however humiliating to exhibit them, there would, probably, be but few persons to give an open eye or a listening ear to them. In spite of these proofs they would find themselves helpless in an enemy's country. Alas, how many a colored brother and colored sister have felt their hearts die within them, whilst travelling, or attempting to travel, through this still caste-cursed and still satan-swayed land!

My soul is sick of this running to constitutions for authority to outrage man. That one is a man proves that he is entitled to all the rights of a man, whatever constitutions or aught else may say to the contrary. Our courts and congress have not yet risen up out of the world's atheism. They still war against God by still refusing to accept and protect man as He presents him. Their highest crime was in tolerating the turning of God's man into man's slave: and, now, they follow up this crime by still tolerating his partial enslavement. We are to welcome every man because every man comes from God, and, whatever his race or complexion, is the child of his and our Father. Human laws are needed to regulate many of the external relations and interests of men;—but the men themselves we are to accept as they are given to us, and to hold their high being with all its essential rights to be sacred and unassailable. Come quickly the day when throughout our country and throughout the world the citing of a law to justify the invasion of fundamental human rights shall be instantly arrested and sternly rebuked as treason against man and contempt of the law of his being and the law of his God!

There are two concessions to our insulted colored countrymen which admit of no delay. One of these is the passage of the Civil Rights Bill, and the other is the breaking up of the Academy at West Point. The great Father in Heaven—the equal Father of his white and colored children—cannot be at peace with our guilty nation, until the abominations against which this Bill is aimed and the kindred abominations, which exist at that Academy, are blotted out. To this end the school itself must be blotted out. It cannot be reformed. The pro-slavery spirit, which, in subservience to the wishes and interests of the slave-power, has, for more than fifty years, been fostered and rampant there, will die only with the death of the school. Government is, always, more or less, complained of for its money matters. But these, in their worst aspect, sink out of sight in comparison with its wrongs against man. Money in comparison with man is of no account. Nothing meaner nor more wicked has Government ever been guilty of than suffering the numerous white cadets to league themselves for insulting, at every turn and corner and in every possible way, the handful of colored cadets. It is because the Government stands back of this league, and suffers it, if indeed it does not positively encourage it, that not one member has had the manliness to break out from it and deal justly with his colored brothers. Surely, a school, pervaded so thoroughly by this mean and cruel spirit, is not the place for training up patriots and christians. This school, which the whole American people are compelled to support, wars frightfully upon all true sense of justice and fair-dealing. It is an insult to the nation—an insult to the grand old hills, which surround it and frown upon it. These sublime highlands, which rank so high amongst the glories of nature, can have no affinity for a thing so violative of nature and so steeped in meanness as the Academy at West Point.

My complaint of the state of things at West Point may, to some minds, appear inconsistent with what I have hitherto and repeatedly said against legislating for social rights. But the insults and abuses at West Point are much more, much worse, than the mere denial of social rights. Moreover, there are no rights, either civil or social, that Government should be allowed to trample under foot. A Government school must be open to all—for it represents all, and is supported by all. If Irishmen or Germans are, as such, systematically insulted and outraged in it, then it cannot be said to be open to them. Nor can it be said to be open to persons of African blood unless they can be in it on self-respecting terms.

This refusal to pass the Civil Rights Bill and this reigning of the diabolical caste-spirit at West Point are but a poor atonement for our ages of crime against the poor black man, and but a poor recompense for his magnanimous services to our country in the late war.

The Republican Party has disappointed us. It has failed to redeem some of its solemnly-made pledges. What can we do?—we who are black men and we white men, who are their friends? I wish we could quit this Party for a time, and thus punish and improve it. But we cannot quit it for even a single year, with safety to the country. For the Democratic Party is still eager to be restored to power, and is as lynx-eyed in watching for opportunities as it was in 1872, when it swallowed up the Greeley party, and made formidable advances toward swallowing up the Republican Party. There are excellent men in the Democratic Party—but the Party remains bad, very bad, hopelessly bad. Had it come into power any time within the last fourteen years our country would have been lost. It would now be lost were that negro-hating and rum-recruiting Party to come now into power. The old Federal Party went down to death under the suspicion of having sympathized with the enemy in the War of 1812-15. And should we ever forget that the Democratic Party sympathized with the rebels in our late War, and sympathized with them too because it one with them in the malignant purpose of perpetuating slavery?

Let us be patient with the Republican Party, a year longer. It came so near passing the Civil Rights bill a few days ago, and, this too, in the face of the solid Democratic vote, that I can hardly doubt it will pass it early in the next session of Congress.

With great regard, cordially yours,

GERRIT SMITH.

I am asked by one and another whether I am in favor of a third term for General Grant. My invariable answer is that I am in favor of any thing and every thing, which will serve to keep the Democratic Party out of power. If his re-nomination is essential to this end, then by all means let it come—yes, and come as often as there shall be the like occasion for it. Better any thing, better every thing, than the ruin that would befall our country from the ascendency of the Party, which sympathized with the rebels in the late Rebellion and with their malignant purpose to perpetuate slavery; and which still cherishes its traditional hatred of the black man. The slaughter of the innocent still going on at the South is due to this hatred, as was all Ku-Kluxism, as was the negro-murdering mob of 1863 in New York, and as was every one of the proslavery mobs that disgraced the North. Whether the outbreak against our colored brethren be at the North or at the South, the Democratic Party is its inspiration, its soul and sustenance. I do not forget that the Democratic Press, in its pictures of the present outrages at the South, presents the patient and long-suffering negro as the aggressor. Nor do I forget that the wolf held the innocent lamb to be guilty of rolling the stream.

In my eye democracy is all one with devilism. Of course, I mean not that genuine democracy, which Thomas Jefferson taught in his lessons for equal human rights. I mean the democracy of these degenerate days—the bastard democracy, which tramples upon these holy rights. Of course, too, I do not include in my denunciation of the Democratic Party all who are in it. There are persons *in* it and yet not *of* it:—persons whose pure principles are at the widest contrast from the base policies of the Party. I do not, however, hold that these exceptional gentlemen are entirely blameless. Their good names, which uphold the bad Party, they should withdraw from it. Instead of allowing their influence to keep the loathsome thing above ground, they should be at work to bury it. Moreover, the good men in the Democratic Party are needed in other parties. They are needed in the Republican Party, which is still far short of what it should be. Called into being to play a conspicuous part in the lifting up of humanity, and with every providential advantage to that end, this Party has not yet fully learned that "a man's a man." Alas, that this lesson, which should ever be the first to be learned by every party both in church and state, should so seldom be learned, either early or late, by any party! We go blundering through life, because ignorant that every man is our brother. It is from such ignorance that the Republican Party failed to pass the Civil Rights Bill. As a matter of course, the Bill had to encounter every Democratic vote in Congress. Nevertheless, the Republican Party was responsible for its failure. It is from such ignorance that Congress and Courts pry into constitutions and statutes for excuses to deny equal rights to the black man. No laws are to be studied to learn human rights. They are written on the brow and in the heart of every man, as he comes from the hand of his Maker. I did hope that the Republican Party would signalize itself above all political parties by boldly taking the ground that we are to accept as of equal rights all the men whom God presents to us, and to scout as trash and atheism all acts of legislatures and all judgments of courts, that are contrary to such equality. Every man is an atheist, who, whatever his pleas of human laws for it, and whether he be a legislator or a judge, goes into the Heaven-defying work of distinguishing the rights of one race of men from the rights of another. He is a traitor to humanity and heaven, who does not insist on the same terms of citizenship for all; on the same laws for all; and on the same respect for all the rights of all.

I notice that the chief objection to the Civil Rights Bill is that it provides for bringing into the same school black and white children. The Bill, though it provides for this intermingling, does not require it. It does not require the State to establish a common school. It only requires that where it does establish one, none shall be shut out from it. Now, in this state of things there is an admirable opportunity for the play of the principle of voluntariness—a principle which, in my humble judgment, is infinitely preferable to State authority in the matter of education. Hence, in the States in question, let those whites, who are ashamed of God (for to be ashamed of His children is to be ashamed of Himself) be left to educate their children, and the blacks be left to do likewise. The blacks, aided by the benevolence of the North and by the benevolence of not a few noble white men at the South, and above all by the impartial God, would not fall behind the whites in this race of education. On the contrary, but a few years would pass away, ere the whites, ashamed of their mean and wicked exclusiveness, and made sensible that the blacks are their equals, would open the way for mixed schools. Let this satanic caste-spirit be left to die out in this way:—but let not the coming and more enlightened generations be mortified at finding it in the laws. Let not the laws of Georgia nor any other State be such as shall tell posterity that their ancestors were the poor, pitiful victims of prejudice and race-hatred.

At another point scarcely less vital than the one I have referred to the Republican Party is still far short of what it should be. The sole office of Civil Government is to protect person and property. But there are not protected where there is the dramshop. The sum of all other perils to person and property is less than those incurred from the dramshop. Nevertheless, Government is so unfaithful to its office, as to suffer the existence and endless multiplication of these manufactories of madness, incendiaries and murderers. It was not to be expected that the Democratic Party would make war upon these manufactories. That Party is itself on the low moral plane of the dramshop, and looks there, more than in all other directions, for recruits. But we had the right to expect that a Party beginning its existence on ground so high as that from which the Republican Party started, and with all the inspirations of its professed justice and humanity, would have availed itself of its large majorities and control of the public sentiment to put an end to this infamous and infernal "retailing of liquors to be drunk upon the premises." We ask nothing at the hands of Government in the name of temperance—for we admit that Government is simply a brute force, which owes nothing to any moral reform. But in the name of protection we demand from it the suppression of the dramshop. Nor even this would we demand were not the evils of dramselling too great to be endured and too mighty to be removed by moral influence. It is only the protection that is indispensable and that we cannot have otherwise, which we call on Government for. Whatever else than dramselling is connected with and promotive of intemperance we will be able to get along with without calling for help on the Hercules of Government.

Why is it that a duty so plain as the shutting up of the dramshop has not been discharged by the Republican Party? In the first place, it has feared that it would thereby reduce its popularity and its votes. It has lacked faith in its power to convert men to the right by its own example of the right. The handful of the abolitionists, by their persistency in the mighty right, succeeded in converting the nation. Truth fails of success only when its advocates fail to trust it. In the second place, the Republican Party has been confused and embarrassed by the extravagant claims, which the great body of the temperance men make upon the Government. They claim that the Government shall take the cause of temperance in hand, remove all hindrances from its way, and crown it with success. The lines, which so distinctly separate the coercion of Government from the liberties of the individual and the family, they would efface; and, instead of contenting themselves with the merely incidental but nevertheless all-sufficient aid of a faithfully-protective Government, they would so far withdraw their cause from the realm of moral influences, as to leave it to be the direct interest and work of Government. As vain, however, as illegitimate would be all the working of Government for the cause of temperance. It is only outside of Government, and with all due acknowledgment of that individual freedom, which is never to be surrendered under any mistaken plea for the good of the whole, that this sacred cause can be carried on to success. No sumptuary laws—no Governmental directions what the people shall or shall not eat and drink—will ever be allowed to override a free people's free choice.

All wise and good men long for the day, which shall witness entire discontinuance of the traffic in intoxicating drinks. But its coming, instead of being hastened, will be greatly retarded, by laws for the absolute prohibition of such traffic and by all political action for such laws. Hence as one, who, for very nearly fifty years, has hesitated at no expenditure of time or money in the cause of temperance, do I regret the organization of political parties for such abolition. And not less do I regret it because it favors the return of the Democratic Party to power—an event, which every man dreads inexpressibly, who has spent his life in fighting the devils of democracy and slavery.

The few thousand votes, which my worthy friend Hon. Myran H. Clark will receive will not help the cause of temperance—for since he goes for absolute prohibition instead of merely against the dramshop, he is on a wrong temperance track. Nevertheless though his vote will be small, yet since seven-eighths of it will come from Republicans, it may possibly be large enough to turn the scale in favor of the Democratic candidate. Such candidate may be a very worthy man—and yet his success, being a Democratic victory, would be a very great evil. I know not who will be the Republican candidate. He may be in himself quite unworthy of the nomination, and yet his success be important because a defeat of the Democratic Party. But the Republican candidate may be the eminent scholar, soldier and statesman who is our present unsurpassed Governor. It was he, who sounded our key-note in the late war, when he ordered the shooting on the spot of whoever dishonored our country's flag: and hence his re-election could not fail to bring joy to every loyal heart. Joy, too, would it bring to every friend of temperance who knows, as I know, that Governor Dix's heart and habits are both on the side of temperance.

I close with saying that I view as absurdities all "Local Option Laws" and "License Laws" and "Civil Damages Laws": and that I would have every instance of drunkenness regarded as a voluntary and responsible insanity, and therefore to be punished severely.

PETERBORO, September 8, 1874. G. S.

EVERY VOTE FOR MR. TILDEN HELPS TO BRING ON THE RUIN OF THE COUNTRY BY HELPING TO RESTORE THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO POWER.

[BY GERRIT SMITH.]

40

Frequently do I hear and read that, inasmuch as each of the two great parties has nominated a worthy man for Governor, the people have now nothing to fear from the election of a Governor. That General Dix is worthy of the office does not need to be argued. Nor should it be doubted that Mr. Tilden, whose discernment and bravery were so efficient in ferreting out these stupendous and matchless frauds in the City of New York, has in himself the qualifications for Governor. Too much praise in this important work cannot be awarded to him, nor to that eminently intellectual and just man Charles O'Conor, nor to the New York Times.

I admitted that Mr. Tilden has in himself the qualifications for this high office. But, so far from his having them in his party also, he has there only absolute and fatal disqualifications for it. Were he the Republican candidate, his party qualifications would be as ample as his personal. But, he is the Democratic candidate: and hence, however great or even unequalled might be his personal merits, he is on the side, that has no right to win. Every vote for Mr. Tilden is a vote for the restoration of the Democratic Party to power: and no one, who dreads as he should do such restoration, can consistently cast such a vote. Mr. Greeley was a great and good man;—but, because his election would have gone far to reinstate the Democratic Party, so those, who dreaded such reinstatement, could not vote for him.

It is a shallow conclusion that we must invariably vote for the best man amongst the candidates. The best man is the worst man to vote for, if he is bound up in the worst party.

For many years I went over the country arguing that, as slavery could not much longer withstand the progress of civilization, it must necessarily, unless speedily disposed of by political action, go out in blood. Nor did I fail to predict this in Congress. But that my limbs and voice are enfeebled by age, I would, now, go over the country again—and, this time, with a message not less important, but far more important, than my former one. I would say to my hearers that either the nation or the Democratic Party must soon break up:—and I would say this because the nation cannot much longer hold out under the war, which this Party continues to make upon its peace and safety, and upon all its highest and holiest interests.

The Democratic Party, organized by our fathers, was a good one. It went, at least in theory and with the honest purpose of a speedy corresponding practice, for the equal rights of all men. It maintained its honor and its usefulness, until in an evil hour it was tempted to increase its votes and power by taking slavery under its wing. And, now for more than half a century, this slavery-transformed Party has not ceased to pour out upon the country it has cursed its demoralizing and destructive influences. In fastening slavery upon us it, quite naturally and even necessarily, dragged down our whole national character into correspondence with this ruling abomination. Every valuable interest was damaged by it. Every virtue was diluted by it. Especially did temperance suffer from it. Dramshops and Democrats sprung up together every where: and Mike Walsh's famous boast that dramshops are the nurseries, schools and recruiting stations of the Democracy was verified, every where. It was the grave imperilling of slavery and then its abolition, that caused the Democratic Party to languish for these dozen years. Take away from it its far more vital support of the dramshop, and it would be left dead—stone dead. Surely, not one step should be taken toward reviving such a Party. Surely, the good men who are so unfortunate as to be *in* it—(no good men can be *of* it)—should hasten to break it up by withdrawing from it.

For thirty years before the Rebellion the abolitionists were working for the overthrow of slavery. They could make but little headway, however, against the Democratic Party. In the eyes of this Party these self-sacrificing philanthropists and patriots were fit only to be mobbed and murdered. Certainly, there should not be one finger to help lift up this Party from prostration to power.

The Rebellion would never have broken out but for the encouragement, which this Party gave it. It promised the rebels fifty thousand armed allies from the City of New York alone. It promised through Ex-President Pierce in his letter to Jefferson Davis that "the fighting will not be along Mason & Dixon's line merely. It will be within our own borders, in our own streets between the two classes of citizens"—meaning the abolitionists and their pro-slavery or democratic neighbors. It opposed with fire and slaughter, as in the instance of the riot in New York in 1863, the drafting of men to fill up our decimated armies. During the whole of the Rebellion the sympathies of this treasonable Party were ever with the South and Slavery. It never rejoiced in our victories, but always in our defeats. The National Democratic Convention held in Charleston in 1860 was openly and shamelessly for slavery. No speaker in it was so vociferously welcomed as W. D. Gaulden of Georgia, whose much applauded boast was that he represented "the African slave-trade interest." The National Convention of this Party in 1864 sunk down to the very depths of treason by resolving and publishing, in the midst of the Rebellion, to our enemy and the world that our resistance to it had proved a "failure", and should be given up, and peace sought for in its stead. It was then and there too, that this Party undertook to oust our beloved Lincoln by nominating General McClellan. I admit that this gentleman, whose record is by no means wholly blameworthy, heartily aimed to preserve the Union—but too evidently he would preserve slavery along with it. An instance of this is to be found in the Proclamation with which he entered Virginia. In that he threatens to put down servile insurrections "with an iron hand." He aimed rather to comfort than to conquer her. He studied the security of her homes rather than suffer them to be desolated. General McClellan was less a Northern commander than a mediator between the North and the South. Here and there were thorough "War Democrats", and they were worthy of all honor for thus standing out from the mass of their Party. But General McClellan was not one of them. Had he been, he would not have been nominated for the Presidency. The Convention, which "yelled assent" to the words of Judge Miller of Ohio, would not have nominated a thorough "War Democrat." Said the Judge: "There is no real difference between a War Democrat and an Abolitionist. They are links of one sausage, made out of the same dog."

We pass on to the National Democratic Convention of the year 1868. General Blair, having been much spoken of as one of its probable candidates, wrote a letter to Colonel Brodhead, four days before the Convention was held. In that letter he goes for revolutionizing the politics of the country by force and arms: and he closes his bloody letter by saying: "I wish to stand before the Convention upon this issue." His letter won the hearts of the Convention, and it promptly put him in nomination for Vice President.

In the light of these illustrations (only few of many) of the bad conduct and worse character of the Democratic Party, how can we with a good conscience help to call it into power again?

Just here, let me say that our success in overcoming the Rebellion, with the whole South and the Democratic half of the North against us, may well be "marvellous in our eyes." Well, too, may we say: "If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, when men rose up against us, then they had swallowed us up quick, when their wrath was kindled against us" By the way, the Rebellion is wrongly called the "Slaveholders' Rebellion." It was more comprehensive than that. It was the Rebellion of the Democratic Party, and should be called the "Democratic Rebellion."

Scarcely was the war over before Southern cutthroats proceeded, in the spirit and expected protection of the Democratic Party, to organize their Ku-Klux Klans. They whipped and shot and hung both black and white Republicans in nearly all the former slave States. They were as ready to shoot white men as black men, if only they were Republicans. Poor Louisiana has suffered more from these Ku-Klux devils than has any other State. Her victims in 1866 numbered two thousand. It was in this year that the Democratic mob in New Orleans murdered the noble Dosty and a hundred others, simply because they presumed to hold a Republican Convention. By the way, Dosty once resided in our County of Madison. In 1868 also, some two thousand more in Louisiana were killed or wounded by these Ku-Klux devils.

I said that the war was over. In point of fact it was not over; nor is it yet over; nor will it ever be over, until the Democratic Party is dead. Its savage and wicked spirit is too chronic to admit of change. It is as unchangeable as the skin of the Ethiopian or the spots of the leopard. Only at the death of this Party will the evil spirit, that has dwelt in it and inspired it for half a century, go out of it.

In 1873 a hundred colored men were murdered at one time in Grant Parish in Louisiana: and now, within the last few weeks, the work of murder has been renewed in several parts of this litt-ter.

rel State. In New Orleans alone not less than a hundred were killed outright or very seriously wounded.

This recent outbreak of Democratic devilism in several Southern States is owing in part to the encouragement, which the Democrats have received from the last Elections in Connecticut and New Hampshire. It is owing, however, in greater part to the hope in these States that, by flattering General Grant with the prospect of a third term, they would thereby purchase his forbearance, and his permission to continue their slaughter of black and white Republicans. When I saw their disappointment, and that the vigilant and faithful Government had scarcely let five days pass ere placing a sufficient number of United States troops in New Orleans and monitors to rake when necessary some of her principal streets, I felt that, in Bible language, our great soldier had come to the Presidency "for such a time as this." Moreover, and again in Bible language, I was ready to exclaim: "O king, live forever!" I readily admit that in all but very extraordinary times two terms of the Presidency are enough for any, even the best, man:—but when there is a war to be put down, and especially such a treasonable and infernal one as this, which the Democratic Party continues to wage, if we are so fortunate as to have a dread warrior at our head, it is wise to keep him there. The South *wanted* Grant because she took it into her head that he would tolerate her high crimes against humanity. She, now, *needs* him to punish and stop these crimes. In respect to these crimes the Democratic Press is either silent or apologetic. The South excuses them on the ground, both that Republicans have not got into office by fair means, and that Republicans, especially if colored men, are not eligible to office. Frauds, whether practised by Democrats or Republicans, are not to be defended:—but the shedding of blood is surely not the remedy for them.

It is true that slavery was once the great curse of the country;—but, for the last fifty years, the Democratic Party has been its far greater curse. In all this time slavery has been as much less to be dreaded than the Democratic Party as is the sword less to be dreaded than the hand that wields it. Easily would the advancing civilization of Christendom have disposed of slavery, had not this bad Party clung to it, as its chief means for perpetuating itself. Slavery and Rum were its life: and, to this day, its life is very largely in its hope that either slavery will reappear, or that some scarcely less advantageous modification of it will take its place.

My old Temperance friends complain that I do not advocate a Temperance ticket. Whenever there is danger of the Democratic Party coming again into power, as there was in 1872, when it cunningly nominated Greeley to catch reformers with, and as there is now, when with hands dipped afresh in the blood of Southern Republicans, it is moving earth and hell to regain its lost ascendency, my first duty—nay, my only political duty—is to oppose the Democratic Party. This abominable Party is the murderer of the colored race which my guilty country has so deeply wronged: and I would let all men become drunkards, ere I would, directly or indirectly, join this murderer.

Although the Republican Party [illegible] the Democratic Party: "Hyperion to a Satyr," there is [illegible] somewhat in it to regret and be ashamed of. If this [illegible] ever fall into a minority, it will be because of its cowardice—most especially its cowardice in not passing the Civil Rights Bill. Had it, with the bold face of conscious rectitude, promptly passed this Bill, which lacked only so few votes, though every Democratic vote was against it, these recent murders at the South would not have been entered upon. This wavering in the fidelity of Republicans to their righteous principles has its worst effect in encouraging the Democratic Party to fresh expressions of its wickedness. Can our poor colored brethren forgive this wavering, this cruel injustice, this alloging ingratitude? I trust they can—and will be persuaded that, after one more triumphant Election, this good, but not yet good-enough, Party, having then enough courage to subdue its faint-heartedness and enough integrity to overcome its truckling, will hasten to accord equal rights to the colored man.

Let me here repeat what I have so often said that the excuse offered by some Republicans for the failure of this Bill—the excuse that it would be contrary to law for Congress to pass it—is as disgraceful as empty. Failing for such a law, if there is such a law! They say that it must be left to the several States to provide for the maintenance of the colored man's manhood. How contemptible is this skulking of a great nation behind one of its States! It was the *nation*, that was responsible for the long and weary years of the colored man's enslavement. It was to save the *nation* that he so forgivingly and magnanimously entered into the *nation's* army. It is the *nation* therefore that is bound to see that within all its limits, he is treated as a man.

Against inborn human rights "there is no law." No law-book is to be looked into to learn what they are—for no law-book can either make or unmake them. The law, written so legibly upon man's sublime being, is the only law by which to ascertain these rights; and both judges and legislators are guilty of blasphemous and impudent atheism when they would supersede this divine law by human enactments. The question whether a colored child may enter the common school or whether a colored man or woman may enter the car or hotel on self-respecting terms, is to be answered not by quotations from constitutions or statutes, but by Him, who "is no respecter of persons", and who "hath made of one blood all nations of men."

I close with saying that there are crimes too great to be forgiven. One of them is the crime of the political party that deliberately upholds slavery, and another is the crime of the political party that turns against its country in time of war. Of both these atrocious crimes has the Democratic Party been emphatically and persistently guilty. Hence, though it may ever so humbly seek our forgiveness, we have a twofold reason for withholding it.

I have not mentioned by name the negro-murdering "white leaguers." Like the Ku-Klux outlaws, they are simply Democrats. Both are fired with the spirit and aims of the Democracy, and "it is not on fire of hell."

PETERBORO, October 1, 1874.

"TO THYSELF BE TRUE!" —SHAKSPEARE.

[BY GERRIT SMITH.]

41

The Republican Party has fallen! It is not, however, because another party has ontvoted it. It could not fall from any cause outside of itself. It could fall only from its own misdeeds and its own weaknesses. As it could succeed only by being true to itself, so it could fail of success only by being untrue to itself. I speak here of success, not in that low and vulgar sense, which counts success in such things as the winning of wealth or battles or office: but I speak of it in that sublime and precious sense, which makes it to consist in the doing of our duty. He succeeds, who, in the sight of heaven, does his duty, even though, in the sight of men, he has failed, utterly failed. On the other hand, he fails of success, who fails of his duty; and none the less does he fail of it, though, in the eye of the world, he has attained to the highest degree of success. Wisely does the poet say that more than to *command* success is to *deserve* it. The world admires the victories of Alexander, Cæsar and Napoleon. Nevertheless, as they were the victories of guilty and reckless ambition, they are, when weighed in the scales of truth and righteousness, the worst of failures—defeats instead of victories. The Republican Party might have got, at the late Election, twice as many votes as it did get; and yet, without a sound heart and righteous purpose, its great vote, instead of being a great success, would have been a great failure—an ignoble failure. On the other hand, its vote, if conceived in an honest heart and cast with clean hands, though not half so great as it was, would have been success—great and glorious success.

It is not possible that any real success can await the Democratic Party—the Party, which Satan inspired to uphold slavery and to strengthen the enemy and cripple the country in our fearful civil war. The good men in that Party (and there are not a few such, who have the misfortune to be in it—born into it or misled into it) will, when they break out from it and abandon it, achieve in that brave and honest act a grand success—and this too, though they may be in the minority forever. But the Party itself has been superlatively wicked too long to be capable of repentance. A party, like an individual, can sin away its day of grace. The only thing for this thrice guilty Democratic Party to do is to break up. It cannot break up in penitence. Let it break up in despair; and so make room for another Party. Indecorous advice must this seem to a Party flushed with recent and unparalleled victories, and so proud in its great numbers as to be contemptuous of the claims of truth and justice. Nevertheless, the only advice to be offered even to such a wild and besotted Party, is the advice of righteousness. In its pre-eminent deceitfulness, it is again shamming repentance. It shammed it in the National Convention at Baltimore in 1872, when, in the face of its ever infernal treatment of the negro, it promised to make the following the very first Article in its platform:

"We recognize the equality of all men before the law, and hold that it is the duty of Government in its dealings with the people to mete out equal and exact justice to all, of whatever nativity, race, color or persuasion, religious or political."

And yet, when the Bill providing for the equality of all men before the law came up in Congress at the last session, it got not one Democratic vote. The excuse for this unanimous opposition to it was that it is for the States and not for the Nation to render this impartial and equal justice. How well disposed the former Slave States are to render it may be learned from the statutes they enacted immediately after the close of the civil war.

North Carolina enacted that a colored person is not a competent witness in a case where a white person is a party; that in apprenticeing colored persons, their old masters are to be preferred for their own masters; that the marriage between a colored and a white person is void, and that the parson who solemnizes it and the clerk who issues the license for it are each to be fined $500; and that for a certain offence, whilst the white offender is to be only imprisoned, the colored offender is to suffer death. (I would here remark that, as a general rule, if a person's blood be one-eighth African, the law classes him with negroes.)

Mississippi enacted, as North Carolina did, in regard to apprentices, and provided very severe punishment for escaping apprentices, and very severe punishment of persons who give food or raiment to such escaping apprentices. It provided for the imposition of heavy fines upon colored vagrants, and, of course, almost every colored person was liable to be arrested as a vagrant. It provided also that, in case of the non-payment of their fines, they should be *hired* (a soft word for *sold*) to such persons as would bid them off on the most favorable terms. It further enacted that no colored person should be allowed to rent or lease any land except in incorporated towns or cities—and not there without the consent of the corporate authorities; and it further enacted that no colored person should be allowed to possess deadly weapons. Its enactments in regard to the incompetence of colored persons in the matters of testimony and marriage were similar to those in North Carolina.

Georgia made laws similar to those referred to in the Codes of North Carolina and Mississippi, providing however severer penalties.

Alabama had some mild features in her severe Code.

South Carolina. Although she allowed colored persons to acquire, own and dispose of property and enjoy the fruits of their labor, her Code was, in the main, very severe. She made the colored offender liable to capital punishment for several offences for which the white offender was not. General Sickles, then in command in that State, supplanted the wicked Code with a manly and merciful Order in which he says: "All laws shall be applicable alike to all the inhabitants."

Florida. Her Code was quite as bad as those of her benighted and bedevilled sisters. She rivalled, so far as blacks were concerned, even poor little Delaware in the use of the pillory and the whipping post.

Virginia did not fall behind the other old slave States in the oppressiveness of her enactments. General Terry wisely and honorably forbade obedience to her exceedingly cruel "Vagrant Act." In his Order to that end he declares the condition of the Freedmen to be worse than had been that of the slaves.

Tennessee. Her enactments appear to great advantage by the side of many I have referred to, especially in their admitting colored persons to be competent witnesses. Nevertheless, she could not allow a colored person to hold office or be a juror.

Texas allowed the colored man to hold property—but in other respects her Code was as severe as those I have spoken of.

Louisiana. Her "Vagrant Act" was severe—but it had not all the cruel features in the "Vagrant Acts" of some of the other States.

Against none of these cruel and wicked enactments came there up one protest from the Democratic Party. Let me now ask what would have become of the Southern blacks; what of any of the Southern people; what, indeed, of the nation, had there not been a Republican Party to annihilate this infernal Democratic legislation?

This misnamed Democratic Party is again feigning repentance—and, this time, in the former Slave States. Where it cannot gain black votes by intimidation, it seeks to gain them by professing a change of heart toward the black men and promising to be their best friend in the future, instead of their atrocious enemy as in the past. The poor blacks, in that extreme ignorance forced upon them by their cruel oppressors, are but too easy a prey to this still atrocious enemy, who appeals now to their fears and now to their hopes. God forbid that they should ever forget that these States, inspired by the big devil of slavery and the not less big devil of Democracy, began, at once after the abolition of slavery, to set up, as seen in the enactments I have referred to, a far worse type of slavery. Far worse I say—since in the former slavery the slave had the benefit of the master's interest in him, and the protection of that humanity which was not extinguished in the breast of every master. [Just here, let me say that there were always kind masters in the South, and that, all over the South, there are, at this day, many, very many kind men. But, unhappily, they are in the minority, and the control of the South is in the hands of the wicked.]

But it is claimed that the Southern whites have, since their enactment of these excessive and murderous cruelties, improved in their bearing toward the negro; and that now he can be safely entrusted to their hands. Where, however, is the proof of this improvement? Were they disposed to stop those Ku-klux Klans who found their choicest amusement in whipping, mutilating, shooting and hanging innocent negroes? So far from it, they were themselves the very soul and body of these satanic associations. These Klans, had not the nation stretched out its mighty arm to stop them, and effected the conviction and punishment of hundreds of their members, would have gone on extending their bloody work until they had made the whole South a very hell upon earth. Where would our nation have been to-day had our President been a man of the complexion of these Klans?—in other words a Democrat? Our condition would have been worse than it was in the darkest days of slavery and its twin devil Democracy. Such "white leagues," as overturned by bloodshed the Government of Louisiana, would have cast down other State Governments also, had not President Grant promptly stopped them. I do not forget the Democratic policy at the North of treating these Democratic slaughters at the South as fancies and fictions, myths and humbugs. Nor do I forget the astonishing fact, that many Northern Republicans are falling in with this infamous policy. Amongst them are many highly respectable editors, who sent gentlemen to the South to learn whether the reported wrongs and outrages are realities. As well might they have appointed a commission to inquire whether the Sun shines at noonday. How absurd to question whether the wholesale slaughter of blacks in Grant Parish and the repeated wholesale slaughter of white and black Republicans in New Orleans actually took place! No rational man doubts it: and no rational man doubts that the same atrocious public sentiment, which called for these slaughters, calls for them on a larger or smaller scale elsewhere. The *animus* of these gentlemen is abundantly manifest in their reports. They went South not for the purpose of finding these wrongs and outrages, but for the purpose of not finding them. They reported that they found none or next to none. How surprising that these editors should have chosen Pro-Slavery Democrats to make these investigations! For, surely, they must be such, who represent Georgia to be the negroes' paradise—that name Georgia, to be sold into which was ever the supreme dread of the negro. For surely they must be Pro-Slavery Democrats who, in the face of the fact that in a few of the Slave States it was a capital offence and in the remainder a State Prison

touch the negro to lend, can yet deliberately say: "Before the war masters, who had any consideration for their slaves, did what they could to render them bright and intelligent." Yes, most emphatically Pro-Slavery Democrats must these *strange* correspondents of these *strangely* Republican Newspapers be, seeing they advise, as a matter of expediency, that a part of the negroes go from the Republican to the Democratic Party. No, gentlemen, this is not a case, that calls for the counsels of expediency. It is never expedient to go from friends to enemies; from saviors to destroyers. It is never expedient to give up moral right for moral wrong: the service of God for the service of Satan. The black man who joins the Democratic Party is not only an ingrate to his self-sacrificing friends, but he is also either a knave or a fool.

But it is insisted, since it is extensively held that the Constitution gives the nation no power to protect the blacks, that the best we can do in the premises is to leave them in the hands of their old masters and to hope for their favorable treatment. But if we have no Constitutional law for protecting them, then by the paramount law of Heaven are we to protect these trodden-down millions: and if we cannot protect them in the name of the nation, then must we protect them in the more commanding name of the human brotherhood.

Will the world never rise up out of its atheism into a recognition of the supremacy of divine law? Will the world never recognize the obligation resting on the whole human brotherhood to save any portion of it from being robbed of these great and essential rights with which its Maker has clothed it? Our colored brethren are emphatically the wards of the nation. It wronged them to the utmost for many generations; and yet, in their boundless magnanimity, they forgave it and shed their blood to save it. If then the nation cannot protect these brethren within the Constitution, it is to protect them without it. It is to cast itself upon the law of God, and to protect them at whatever expense to human law.

We, however, have Constitutional power to protect them. What was the Constitution amended for but to give this power: and if it does not give it, what blunderers they were who stood at it! It does clothe Congress with all needed power in the case. We must remember that the Constitution is no longer to be interpreted in the darkness of slavery, but in the light of liberty; no longer in the interest of slavery but in behalf of the cause of liberty. Too long did the friends of God and man suffer under the Pro-Slavery interpretation of the Constitution. They are now prepared to lift their hand to high Heaven and swear that they will suffer under it no longer. A multitude that no man can number—black and white both—are prepared to take this great oath. If the Anti-Slavery battle must be fought over again, they desire it to be in their day.

Bad, however, as is the Democratic Party, there is one respect in which it ranks higher than the Republican Party. It is more consistent and more steadfast. An old friend of my youth was wont to say: "I had rather see a man determinedly wrong than whiffingly right." The unflinching determination of the Democratic Party, though it be a determination to serve the devil, commands a measure of our respect, whilst the "Good Lord, good devil" policy, into which the Republican Party occasionally slides, does not fail to awaken our contempt.

Soon after the war this great and good Party began to temporize and halt in regard to our currency. No reasonable person can claim that it was bound to raise this war-created and war-necessitated currency immediately to the level of gold—but it should not have delayed to give it that upward direction. The nation would have been content had the Republican Party used the whole of the remainder of the first hundred years of our national existence in completing the approximation of our currency to specie.

But I did not call the Republican Party a fallen Party because it fell behind another in the number of its votes. Nor do I call it a fallen Party because of its errors on financial questions—for these were errors far more of the head than of the heart. Nor do I call it a fallen Party because of its vacillation on the Civil Service Reform. The argument against this Reform is, in my judgment, quite as strong as the argument for it. The genius of our form of government and the characteristics of a Republican people call for the widening rather than the narrowing of the range from which to select office-holders. The learned few in a monarchy are more learned than the learned few in a republic. But the masses in a republic are more enlightened than the masses in a monarchy. It is wisdom rather than learning, that is called for in an office-holder; and, whilst many a learned man, and many a man who can answer all school-book questions, is nevertheless wanting in wisdom and in fitness for office, many an illiterate man is wise, and, in the main, eminently fit for the office he holds. Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson and Dean Richmond passed their youth in remarkable illiteracy: but no one will deny that they had intellectual power for the highest offices. I conclude under this head with the remark that it is better to leave it to the appointing power to make such appointments, intellect and scholarship both considered, as, on the whole, it shall deem most proper.

Nor do I call it a fallen Party because Republicans combined with Democrats to increase the salaries of our principal office-holders. With the exception of the Judges, they were already amply paid; and these fat office holders should have scorned to increase the burdens of the nation, whilst it is so deeply in debt.

No, it is for none of its misjudgments in regard to such matters that I call the Republican Party a fallen Party. I call it such because it has fallen in integrity and justice, and has, therefore, fallen in the sight of Heaven. This Party began its existence on a high moral plane. It immediately set out to stop slavery: and then slavery, with arms in its hands and with the help of the Democratic Party, set out to stop the Republican Party. This heaven-called and heaven-employed Party then took another step upward, and resolved to conquer and expel slavery. Thanks to Lincoln and Grant and their fellow-laborers, it did this great work bravely and triumphantly! To its poor black brother, who helped fight its battles, it promised the protection of equal laws; and most emphatically and solemnly did it do this at the second nomination of President Grant. This protection it now shamefully, infamously, and most wickedly withholds. Only at the last Session of Congress, it failed to pass the Bill for making men of all complexions equal before the laws. It is true, as I have said, that the Bill got not one vote from the Democratic Party. It had no right to expect one vote from that bad Party. But the Republican Party, being in a vast majority, was responsible for its failure.

In saying then that the Republican Party is fallen, I have not spoken extravagantly. God grant that its fall may not be final! God grant that, ere long, it may be able to exclaim in the words of the prophet: "When I fall, I shall arise!" If the Party shall, penitently, algoalize the opening of the next Session of Congress by the enactment of a law, which shall make all men equal before the law, it will then be on its feet again, and more firmly than ever. Do I mean that it will then be able again to out-vote the Democratic Party? Oh no! such success may never await it. If, however, by means of its righteousness the Republican Party shall ever be in the minority, and if by means of its unrighteousness the Democratic Party shall ever be in the majority, then will that minority over be a glorious success and that majority over be a total failure.

What, however, shall prevent the Republican Party, if it shall again plant its standard by the side of truth, from gathering around itself a majority of the American people? Nothing but being untrue to itself—to its origin, history, aims and promises; nothing indeed but its own treachery to the truth. Between the truth and the human heart there is a mutual adaptation. Only because it is misrepresented does the truth fail to win the heart. The Scripture represents that what the world lacks to be converted to the truth is that its professed followers prove their faithfulness to the truth by their oneness in it. Had the Republican Party stood by the black man from first to last, its sublime fidelity to the truth would, ere this, have made an impression on the flinty heart of the Democracy: but, by their desertion of him, they have disgraced themselves, disqualified themselves to be teachers, cheapened the black man's rights, and made that heart more flinty than ever.

The most relied-on and oftenest-repeated objections to the Civil Rights Bill are that it calls for social equality, and compels the mingling of white and colored school children. It does not touch the question of social equality, and it does not compel the establishment of any school. It only requires that whatever the law provides or ordains shall be equally applicable to all classes and conditions of people. If the whites of Georgia wish to have God and His colored children shut out of their school, they can have it so without law to this end; and the philanthropy of the North will, as it now does so cheerfully, help educate her colored children. All we ask is that if Georgia sets up a school by law, she shall not restrict its privileges to children of one complexion, but make them common to all. It is not her wrongs without law but her wrongs by law, that we deprecate. It is said in behalf of the old Slave States that they can and will have separate schools for the white and the colored children. They neither can nor will. The richest State in the Union is not able nor willing to pay for two sets of school-houses and two sets of teachers. And if this scheme were practicable, it would entirely fail to relieve the colored race of their deep and stinging sense of disgrace in being excluded from a school where white children are educated.

I close with saying, that if the Civil Rights Bill, or one essentially like it, shall fail to become a law at the next Session of Congress, the Republican Party will be responsible for making five millions of our countrymen the everlasting and unforgiving enemies of our country. Characteristically gentle and patient as they are, they may nevertheless be driven by the sense of their wrongs to fearful and widespread violence. Never, never again, will they, nor ought they, to take the side of their country in time of War. It will no longer be *their* country, but their *enemy's* country. They can, however, afford the loss—for the God of justice will still be their God.

(I trust that a generous public will be patient under my too frequent writings. I could not forbear to lay my testimony once more upon the Slavery and Democracy-perverted conscience of my country.)

PETERBORO, Nov. 23, 1874.

COLORED CHILDREN EJECTED FROM AN INDIANA SCHOOL.—INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 3.—Brazil, Clay County, about 60 miles west of this city, is in a fever of excitement over the practical application of the recent decision of the Supreme Court regarding colored children in the schools. Thirty-five colored children have been ejected from the public schools there by order of the local trustees, and against the earnest protestations of the School Superintendent. Many of the children cried bitterly when informed that they must leave, and begged to be allowed to remain, but the trustees insisted that they must leave, and they were so informed by their teachers. The Board of Trustees consists of three members, one of whom is a Democrat and two are Republicans.
—[N. Y. TRIBUNE.

I envy not the man, who can read this extract with dry eyes and an unmoved heart. I envy not the man, who cares not for the grief, which wrung the little breasts of these dear children, as they were driven from the school rooms they loved, and from the white children they loved, and by whom they were loved.

Where rests the responsibility for this outrage? Chiefly on the hesitancy of the Republican Party to pass the pending Civil Rights Bill—chiefly on the perfidy of this Party, which said in its platform of 1872;

"Complete liberty and exact equality in the enjoyment of all civil, political and public rights should be established and effectually maintained throughout the Union by efficient and appropriate State and Federal legislation. Neither the law nor its administration should admit any discrimination in respect of citizens by reason of race, creed, color or previous condition of servitude."

If the Republican Party had had the bravery and justice to pass the Bill, such cowards and scoundrels as those in Indiana would have been cowed in the presence of these high qualities, and would not have dared to do this deviltry. But the shrinking of the Party from passing the Bill gave these cowards and scoundrels ample occasion to despise both the Bill and the Party.

May the God of justice and mercy prompt this fallen Party to rise to its feet by passing, very speedily, this Bill or one essentially like it! If the passing of it be delayed, hell will break loose again all over the land, as it did in the days of the "Fugitive Slave Act," when, even in the remotest North, slave hounds were, every where, upon the track of poor men, women and children.

But why do I blame the Republican Party only—and, this too, notwithstanding it gave nearly its entire Congressional vote for this Civil Rights Bill? Why do I not blame the Democratic Party also—the Party, which gave not one vote for it, and which was the great upholder of slavery and the ally of our enemy in the Civil War? My answer is—because nothing better was to be expected from such a Party. In the light of its ever disdainful and cruel treatment of the negro, all the world knew that the strong words for him in its platform of 1872 were only hypocrisy. But the different character of the Republican Party made it entirely reasonable to regard the like strong words in *its* platform as spoken in sincerity.

I proceed to ask, what is the excuse for this crushing of hearts and blasting of hopes—the hearts and hopes of even innocent and helpless little children? It is that the laws require it. Whose laws? Not His surely, who is "no respecter of persons" and "hath made of one blood all nations"? His laws forbid all crimes against our common humanity—all abuse and contempt of any portion of it.

It is claimed that the Federal Constitution, if not indeed affording a warrant for striking at the very manhood of our colored brother in the atrocious and murderous wrongs inflicted upon him, does nevertheless not forbid the crime. In its obligation to protect the rights of citizenship is included its obligation to protect all the rights of manhood. I might admit that ingenuity can dig down into this instrument and bring up what, with the help of the pro-slavery training of the country, shall look a little like an apology for oppression and injustice. But the day for interpreting the Constitution in behalf of oppression and injustice has passed away. We now read it in the light of that liberty and justice, which, as they shine all over its surface, determine its legal character, whatever in its depths may be tortured against that character.

Reluctant as I am to "speak evil of dignities," I must nevertheless be frank enough to say, that this distinction, which is drawn between national citizenship and state citizenship is an absurdity. I need not add another to my arguments on former occasions, that national citizenship cannot be enjoyed without concurrent state citizenship, or rather without the oneness of the latter with the former. I add that this national citizenship, which can be baffled and brought to naught by state citizenship, is a discovery, which reflects but little honor upon its eminent judicial discoverers. To be a citizen of the nation is to be a citizen of every state in the nation.

But candor requires me to go farther, and to confess that I would have no account whatever made of laws, which are repugnant to the divine laws. The conclusion that such laws are no laws needs above all things to be accepted. If widely accepted now, it would work such a blessed revolution in the minds of men, as would make the nineteenth century the glory of all the centuries. It would do more than all the pulpits and presses toward lifting up mankind out of practical and blasphemous atheism into the sweetly transfiguring recognition of the paramount claims of heaven.

Just here, let me thank Archbishop Manning, in the name of truth and righteousness, for bravely saying in his Reply to Gladstone that "the civil allegiance of no man is unlimited, and therefore the civil allegiance of all men who believe in God, or are governed by conscience, is in that sense divided." The Archbishop's virtual declaration is that no man is at liberty to obey a human law, which is in conflict with a divine law.

The sphere of human law and the sphere of divine law must be kept distinct from each other. Human law must consent to accept and protect with entire impartiality all men, as they come from the hand of the creator. Human law is in its proper sphere when, acknowledging the equal rights of all men, it regulates the dealings and intercourse between man and man. But when it undertakes to make one man a despot and another a slave; one man merchandise and another his owner; or does, in any wise, invade the essential manhood of any portion of the human family and curtail its inborn and God-given rights, it then breaks out of its sphere, makes war upon the divine will and divine arrangements, and becomes no law.

Am I asked what are the divine laws regarding man and protective of him? I answer that they are the laws of his being; written all over it; just what it calls for; and in the panoply and protection of which he stands. The equal rights of all men make "equality before the law" the right of every man. As sacred and inviolable is this right as his right to the members of his person.

But must not the laws be executed? Not those, which are in opposition to the divine laws. As mere chaff before the wind must they be counted—and, this too, even though they reach the dignity of Constitutional laws. Legislators, judges, commissioners and executive officers, who had a part in reducing the fugitive to slavery, were all atheists and were all guilty in the sight of God of a heinous crime. Heinous as it was, however, I had about as soon stand in their shoes in the great reckoning-day as in the shoes of the heartless men, who, whether in the capacity of legislators, or judges, or in any other capacity, had a responsible part in thrusting from the common school these dear little children, whose only crime was the complexion, which their Heavenly Father gave them.

The common plea for obeying wicked laws is that they command obedience. Our one and sufficient plea for disobeying them is that of the Apostles: "We ought to obey God rather than men."

I do not forget how very odious and even ludicrous formerly was all respect for the higher law in this land where the low law of slavery had obtained for centuries. Scarcely less odious and ludicrous is it now, when laws kindred to the low law of slavery call for the shutting out from the school children as dear to the heart of God as any other children, and for shutting out of the car and steamboat and hotel persons, however well-bred and refined, if only their complexion can be found fault with.

Alas, the South! Did the low law of slavery bring her peace? Far from it! But by the tears and bloodshed, poverty and desolation to which it brought her, it abundantly convinced her that "there is no peace to the wicked" And, now again, she cries out for peace—and, now again, her sins will not let her have it. Peace will be hers when she shall consent to "do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God," and not till then. It is for her to elect whether she will have it now, or whether she will, for twenty or thirty years longer, be the prey of a troubled conscience and appalling fears. It will not, however, be *ten* years, ere she will see, and lament with tears of anguish, the great and guilty mistake of her present attitude. With the help of the many truly christian white men and women there are in the South, and with the help of that philanthropy of the North, which already pours out upon this object scores of thousands of dollars yearly, the colored masses will be rapidly educated: and let me here add that just so rapidly will they assert their manhood before the terror-stricken faces around them, provided the policy of making enemies of these masses shall be persisted in.

I close with beseeching the South to accept the wise advice, which President Grant offers her in his recent Message. He is her friend; and he says to her: "TREAT THE NEGRO AS A CITIZEN AND VOTER, AS HE IS AND MUST REMAIN." Let her bear in mind, too, that the President has no pride of learning, and does not give to the word "citizen" the narrow definition, which the ingenuity of judicial learning gives to it. He is, very eminently, a man of common sense, and therefore does he give to the word a common sense and comprehensive meaning.

G. S.

PETERBORO, December 12, 1874.

GERRITT SMITH FOR GRANT.

Speech to his Neighbors at Peterboro, N. Y., June 22d.

To the Editor of the Detroit Post.

The efforts of the advocates of the Democratic-Greeley party is to make people believe that only office holders and their dupes and interested conservatives support Grant for President. The last of May I spent an hour at his home with Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and found him decided against Greeley, *because the unrepentant rebels want him to run*, and he considers him lacking in the grit and nerve necessary to resist them. He sustains Grant as the fit man for the emergency.

And next comes "a speech to my neighbors," by Gerrit Smith, from which I make the following extracts. The signal sagacity and long experience of Mr. Garrison and the high character and ability of Gerritt Smith entitle their words to some weight, and surely they are not office-holders or seekers, or conservatives, and can hardly be classed as dupes of designing men. G. B. S.

Mr. Smith spoke as follows: The Democratic party is my dread. The Republican party is my hope. What is this party of which I am so much afraid? I need not say that it is not the original Democratic party—the party of my childhood and youth. That was a worthy party—a party for human rights and human equality. It was the reform party of its day. It favored universal suffrage and the abolition of imprisonment for debt, and many other beneficent changes. But this modern Democratic party—this degenerate Democratic party—is very unlike the original Democratic party. It is utterly unworthy of the name it has so falsely, not to say so knavishly, assumed. * * * * * * *

The hope of the country is in the continued ascendency and continued reformatory spirit of the Republican party; and, if there be times when, on account of its persistent refusal to adopt some vital reform, we shall feel bound to withdraw from it, the withdrawal should ever be with the hope that it may be but temporary, and may result not in loss but in gain to the party.

Another Presidential election is at hand. Whom shall we vote for? In the light of what we have said we cannot vote for candidates of the Democratic party, however worthy they may be. Grant and Wilson are my own choice—first, because they are the candidates of the Republican party, and the upholders of its righteous principles, and second, because they are wise and honest men and have especial claims to our votes. * * * * * *

But may not the Democratic party be allowed to put up and vote for Republicans? Yes!—but Republicans should, as a general thing, pause long before voting for them. But suppose that party puts up for President so pronounced and eminent a Republican as Horace Greeley—cannot Republicans consistently vote for him? Certainly not. For his election would as surely be the success of the Democratic party as the election of President Grant will be the success of the Republican party. The election of Mr. Greeley will not turn the Democratic party into a Republican party—but it will turn him into a Democrat—not, I trust, into one of the worst type—but still into a Democrat. In anticipation of merely his nomination he talked differently about the tariff from what he had been wont to do; and, instead of continuing to uphold the President's hands in his warfare against Ku Kluxism, he joined himself to those who would palsy them. He had now 10 words against the "Carpet-baggers" where he had one against the Ku Klux. No, Mr. Greeley's election would not assimilate the Democratic party to him, but him to it. So it has ever been in such cases—and how, with his kindly and obliging spirit, can he prove an exception? I do not say that Mr. Greeley will set out to be a Democrat; and I admit that he may be largely insensible of the progress of his change. Nevertheless, whether consciously or unconsciously, he will be moulded, and this too at no very slow rate, into harmony with the general views and policies of this great party, which, as seductively as flatteringly, places him at its head. But what if Mr. Greeley should, notwithstanding his candidacy and election, remain miraculously unchanged?—it does not follow that his election would not be the success of the Democratic party. The President is not all the Government. Congress is far more nearly all of it; and Mr. Greeley's election would be quite likely to result in a Democratic Congress. Many of these seceding Republicans will sell their votes to Democratic candidates in exchange for Democratic votes for Mr. Greeley. Unless human nature shall change, the sympathy between these seceding Republicans and the Democratic party will, all the land over, ripen into open coalitions. The nomination of Mr. Greeley by the Democratic party—a nomination to be consummated by the Baltimore Convention—is, in effect, a scheme to draw off by this use of his name enough Republicans to turn the scale in favor of Democratic ascendency. I have not spoken to disparage Mr. Greeley. I only lament that he should have sought his honors by lending his name and influence to the Democratic party, and by damaging and endangering that other party, which he had served so long and so well. Right here let me answer the question—Where is the Democratic party to be found? Is it to be found in the recent Cincinnati Convention or in the approaching Baltimore Convention? It is to be found in both. It is to be found wherever war is made upon the Republican party. To call the handful of Republicans represented in the Cincinnati Convention the Republican party is absurd. The hope of that convention was in the Democratic party. Its candidates are the candidates of the Democratic party, and are to be beaten as such and not as candidates of the Republican party.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Sumner speaks of President Grant's insult to Frederick Douglass, and through him to the colored race. The insult exists but in Mr. Sumner's imagination. Certain it is that Mr. Douglass is insensible of it—for he is still the uncomplaining and warm friend of the President. Mr. Sumner says that the President, in inviting the San Domingo Commissioners to dine with him, forgot Mr. Douglass. But Mr. Douglass, though Mr. Sumner speaks of him as one of the commissioners, was not one of them. Like Gen. Sigel, he had served the commission in the capacity of Assistant Secretary, and like him, he was not with the commissioners (Senator Wade, Doctor Howe and President White) when they called "informally" upon the President and were "informally" invited to dine with him.

* * * * * * *

Let us, my neighbors, instead of disparaging President Grant, and dwelling on the few errors in his administration, be thankful that he makes us so wise and safe a President. Very foolish is the man who, instead of enjoying the light and heat of the sun, spends all his days in mousing after and magnifying the spots upon it.

I close with saying that we must have Grant for our President a few years longer. The antislavery battle is not yet fought out—nor will it be so long as a single shred of Ku Kluxism remains, nor so long as there are persons who are deprived, on account of their complexion, of so much as one civil right.

Is there a black man either at the North or at the South who is inclined to vote the Democratic ticket? He had better die than do it. He had better die than so wrong his race and so wrong us, whose lives have been lives of suffering and sacrifice for the redemption and welfare of his race. Will not William Lloyd Garrison and his fellow-laborers have lived in vain, if now, at the last, the black man for whom they have lived shall turn against them and go over to their and the black man's enemy?